THE Lutheran Quarterly

lume III NOVEMBER, 1951 Number 4

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOL SEMINARY

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume III NOVEMBER, 1951 Number 4

CONTENTS

AN EDITORIAL NOTE 339

THE MEANING OF THE REFORMATION TODAY ..... *Richard Kroner* 340

JESUS, JOHN, PAUL (Part II) ..... *Anton Fridrichsen* 353

MSGR. KNOX'S OLD TESTAMENT IN ENGLISH ..... *Charles M. Cooper* 366

OF REPENTANCE ..... *Bertha Paulssen* 383

EVANGELICAL WITNESS IN LATIN AMERICA ... *William George Arbaugh* 393

FIFTY YEARS OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY (Part II) ... *C. Umhau Wolf* 402

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Brilioth, *Nattvarden i evangeliskt gudstjänstliv* (C. Bergendoff) 412
Grant, *An Introduction to New Testament Thought* (R. D. Snyder) 412
Smith, *On Whom the Spirit Came* (M. A. Helland) 414
Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (R. D. Snyder) 416
Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah* (H. C. Leupold) 417
Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* (R. H. Boyd) 417
Douglass, *The Snowden-Douglass Sunday School Lessons, 1952* 419
Tillich, *Systematic Theology, Volume I* (T. A. Kantonen) 419
Schneider, *Kennen und Erkennen* (W. O. Doescher) 420
Lamont, *The Illusion of Immortality* (G. B. Arbaugh) 422
Hough, *The Dignity of Man* (J. J. Raun) 424
Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* (P. L. Holmer) 426
Schilpp, *Albert Einstein, Philosopher-Scientist* (C. W. Kegley) 427
Brilioth, *Herdabrev till Uppsala ärkestift* (E. M. Carlson) 430
Hyma, *Renaissance to Reformation* (T. G. Tappert) 431

CONTRIBUTORS 432

INDEX TO VOLUME III ii

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Office of Publication, Seminary Hill, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, Books for review to the Book Review Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
CONRAD BERGENDOFF
Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor
THEODORE S. LIEFELD
Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager
ANDREW S. BURGESS
Luther Seminary, Como Ave. and Luther Place, St. Paul, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG, SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aims:* The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

An Editorial Note

THIS ISSUE concludes Vol. III of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. The experiment of a common theological journal for the Lutheran seminaries of America gives promise of achieving success. THE QUARTERLY has been conceived as an interpreter of the Lutheran Church of the world and has sought the support of Lutherans of all lands. Not that it is a spokesman for world Lutheranism, but in seeking to interpret the Lutheran Church to its American constituency, the QUARTERLY has ever been mindful that Lutheran thought cannot be identified with any one nation. It is the purpose of the publication to continue this policy of so defining the Lutheran dimension of the QUARTERLY.

As we enter the fourth year, the Editorial Council is happy to announce the addition of the following seminaries as participating in the sponsorship of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.
Central Seminary, Fremont, Neb.
Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Ill.
Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada, Waterloo, Ont.
Grandview Seminary, Des Moines, Iowa.
Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.
Lutheran Seminary, Saskatoon, Sask.
Northwestern Lutheran Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.
Southern Lutheran Seminary, Columbia, S. C.
Suomi Seminary, Hancock, Mich.
Trinity Seminary, Blair, Neb.

Thus seventeen Lutheran seminaries of the United States and Canada unite in this venture to produce in the English language a journal of Lutheran thought which shall confront the mind of today with the enduring gospel of Jesus Christ.

The Meaning of the Reformation Today

RICHARD KRONER

THE Protestant Reformation is one of the greatest events in the history of Christianity. Like all great events it has so many aspects and facets, so many different strands and strains that it would be over-bold to say what is the essence or the center of this multifarious and complex movement. And this difficulty is even enhanced by the fact that in different periods of Protestant history different features came to the fore so that the identical meaning of the Reformation is hardly to be recognized in all the transformations and manifestations which it underwent. Indeed, every epoch has given its own peculiar answer to the question, so immensely rich and productive is the original event.

When Protestantism was in the prime of its development its constructive and creative power was so overwhelming, its truth so obvious, its consequences so enormous, that no adherent of the movement would have allowed any doubt of its spiritual necessity and its salutary effect. To be sure, there were some excesses in the beginning caused by those who held that Luther and his friends did not go far enough, and these excesses aroused misgivings in the minds of the leaders. But these exaggerations did not generate any uncertainty about the right and the goodness of the new interpretation of the faith. After so many centuries of Protestant existence, Protestant rule, Protestant institutions and Protestant achievements, the temper of the believers is no longer the same. We are no longer in the situation of those who discovered the new land and risked their life in conquering it. We no longer feel the adventure and the enthusiasm of those who had been oppressed and were eager to break the yoke of the Roman Church. We no longer call the Pope an Anti-christ. Centuries of religious wars and then of religious tolerance have changed the Protestant mood and mind. We no longer have to fight for our way of life as the

Reformers did; we no longer fear the tyranny of Rome. The Reformation is for us an established fact. The nations which have adopted the evangelical faith are those who have shaped the history of modern times and have produced the greatest wealth of cultural achievements since antiquity. A Spanish Armada no longer threatens the existence of Protestant power. And, so, we are in a position where we can afford to criticize Protestantism, to admit that there are deficiencies in the results brought about by the development of the new spiritual order and especially by the influence which this order had in the realm of general culture. We know that Protestantism has not regained paradise; that the spirit of materialism and the danger of spiritual anarchy have grown on the soil of Protestant domination. We know that Protestant culture is exposed to a severe censure. Is, perhaps, the Protestant faith itself responsible for the symptoms of decay which we anxiously note in the present world situation?

It is a paradox that the very victory and triumph of the Reformation over the Roman Church has finally created a situation in which this victory is menaced and in which the fundamental issues of the Reformation are again at stake. The full sway of Protestant faith, the unimpeded and unrestrained operation of the powers dormant in the movement has made manifest the inner limitations of its truth and its right, limitations not so much of the faith itself, but of the intellectual and cultural system created by the ideas of the Reformers. This does not mean, of course, that we Protestants are beginning to doubt whether the revolt against the Roman system was justified. He who has tasted the spiritual freedom of evangelical faith will never be ready to give it up again. Never will we bow down before that tyranny which the Papal church employs. Never will we permit the salvation of the soul to depend upon the decision of a priest, be he as high in rank as he may. Never will we return to the idea of justification by means of special works which are said to be equivalent to inner repentance. However, it is not this question which we seriously confront. The new crisis does not concern the antagonism between the Catholic and Protestant system. This alternative is not of actual importance to us. Rather it is

the relation between our Protestant faith and our civilization which worries us today. We have to search our mind and our conscience to find out whether and in which sense the symptoms of cultural anarchy and degeneration may be an outcome of the Reformation, and whether we can do something to remedy the present situation without leaving the ground on which we as Protestants stand, the ground which according to our basic conviction is the ground of Christianity in its deepest and original sense.

CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY AND THE REFORMATION

From the beginning Protestantism was a reinstated and reinforced evangelical faith in the redeeming work of Christ. The Reformation did not mean a proclamation of a new faith or the inauguration of altogether new principles. On the contrary, it was supposed to be a renewal of the oldest and purest form of the Christian community, a rejection of later abuses and errors, a purgation of the eternal truth from temporal misinterpretations and distortions. Luther did not think of a revolt against the church when he attached his theses to the door of the castle church in Wittenberg. He only wanted to fight the corrupted practice of selling indulgences. He appealed from the pope misinformed to a pope better informed. Only by the course of events was he prompted to go farther and farther, until the final break with Rome was inevitable and indeed incurable.

The Reformation was a return to the unalloyed Gospel. It was intended to be a reconstruction of the relation between God and man as Jesus had commanded it and of which his own life was the perfect model. The reformers wanted to restore the simplicity and holiness of the early community and to do away with the pomp and the worldly pretensions of the Roman church. They wanted to transform the bond between the believers so that it would agree with the high standards of the kingdom of God as Jesus had declared them. But this exalted design was to be accomplished in a world more or less fashioned by the selfishness of unregenerate man, in a world aiming at ends not compatible with those high standards.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Reformers met the same obstacles, the same hostility, the same indifference which the apostles had met. However, the apostles were prepared to undergo martyrdom; they knew that Christ and Caesar, that God and World can never be reconciled to each other; and, therefore, they lived a life totally separated from the ruling society and the surrounding pagan civilization, from all the cultural activities and enjoyments of their period. The Protestants on the other hand lived from the beginning as citizens of both the city of God and the city of man, the kingdom of Christ and the body politic of their own time. Therefore, they had to solve the difficult task of bringing about a reconciliation between these opposites.

The Reformers, in other words, had to replace the Roman type of Christian civilization by a new type to be moulded according to the renewed and purified faith which they cherished. They could not simply ignore the existence of society and state, of wealth and poverty, of science and art, as the early disciples had done. They could not avoid all the temptations and obligations which the life in the world produces. They found themselves entangled in a network of profane relationships which their keen devotion to the Gospel had to penetrate and to conquer so that it would conform to their faith. The hope of a speedy end of this world which the disciples and apostles had nursed in their heart could not be maintained or renewed.

Of course, a certain chasm between the world and the community of the saints was not to be eliminated, as indeed it can not be eliminated by any system of life and thought. A certain tension between the secular and the sacred order as well as between those who serve a secular cause professionally and those who devote their whole strength to the service of God is inevitable so long as the kingdom of heaven is not yet fully established on earth. But all depends upon the way in which this inevitable tension and this necessary chasm is reconciled to the idea of an undivided Christendom and a universal participation in the grace and love of Christ. All depends upon the concrete and definite system which deals with the problem arising out of the infinite distance between man and

God, between imperfect and perfect holiness, between earth and paradise.

THE ROMAN SYSTEM

The Roman system had grown out of the conditions under which the Christian community existed when the age of persecution and oppression came to an end, when to be a Christian was no longer an obstacle to public office and authority. Christendom then entered society and state, and began to participate actively and creatively in the civilization of antiquity. However, a gulf still continued to separate those Christians who aimed at a profound and intimate fellowship with Christ and those who lived, in spite of their membership in the church, a more or less worldly life devoted to ambitions and pleasures. And this gulf began to widen; it was even made legitimate by the church itself when the peculiar system of Roman thought unfolded within the now Christian society and civilization. This peculiar system was based on the presupposition that the majority of people are not able, and indeed, do not wish to live a saintly life, and that no discipline whatever, no ecclesiastical training, no educational wisdom would ever accomplish the humanly impossible. The church gave up the attempt to bring into being a community of disciples in the original sense of this word. Instead, the church divided the body of Christians into two groups: the laymen and the clergymen, and again the second group into two classes according to the degree to which their members were willing and eager to obey special ascetic rules and attained thereby a special saintliness, at least in the eyes of the Roman Church. This distinction was more and more clearly defined and elaborated when monasteries and spiritual orders like the Benedictines, the Franciscan, the Dominican and others were organized and gradually became very powerful. This whole system underlay the Catholic society of the Middle Ages and reached its completion and consummation in the centuries before the Reformation. It is a system based on the idea of a hierarchy of human souls and personalities, measured by their Christian devotion and conduct in life. The word "hierarchy" literally means "sacred or-

der." The hierarchical principle assumes that there are stages of perfection and therefore of rank within the Christian society, and that the church possesses the measure to judge where a man stands on this ladder. The Pope as the vicar of Christ on earth was regarded as the top of this order and as authorized by Christ himself to determine every one else's place in it.

In this way the opposition between heaven and earth, between the city of God and the city of man, between the ideal goal of Christian aspiration and the stark reality of sin, or between eternity and time—this opposition was thus, though not effaced, yet at least subordinated to a system recognized as actually existing in agreement with the will of God, as expressed in the Church of Rome. The monk in his cell doing penance and works of charity, or studying the holy Scripture and sacred theology, made good what the ordinary layman neglected to do, or what the outright scoundrel and the villain perpetrated.

A balance was created in that way. Christian love compensated for the lack of purity and devotion on the lower levels of the hierarchical order, as Christ Himself had compensated by his sacrificial death for the sins of all mankind.

In spite of the imperfection prevailing in the majority of human lives within the Christian society, Christian perfection seemed thus achieved by the whole. The laymen knowing that there was a stratum of holy Christlike penitents in the upper levels of the system, participated indirectly and in a collective fashion in this universal perfection of Christendom and enjoyed thereby the benefit of the church and the saving work of its head. Of course, the precondition of this entire conception was the belief that the church is the mystical body of Christ Himself, and as such perfect in sanctity and holiness; and that the subordination of the world to the church ransoms in perpetuity the lukewarm or wicked behavior of the vast majority of the believers. This belief, shared by all Christians through so many centuries, was the basis of belief in Christ and God Himself. The church was in the foreground of faith, it was the real object of veneration and adoration, the visible and yet also divine effect of the redeeming and sanctifying

work of Christ, of that grace and love which had reconciled the world to God, as Scripture says. This system furthermore enabled the church to reconcile the exalted conception of a truly Christian community not only with the poor and miserable state of society, but also with the splendid and shining inheritance of ancient culture. The merger between this inheritance and the stern and strict spirit of Christian obedience and ascetic self-discipline had begun already in the second century. But it had increased gradually and steadily in scope and significance throughout the Catholic centuries. When the Germanic barbarians conquered the Roman Empire, this process was slowed down or entirely interrupted, but soon it set in again and reached its climax in the same period before the Reformation in which also the idea of the hierarchical order fully triumphed. The Germanic tribes who had trampled down the remnants of ancient architecture and sculpture, when they sacked Rome and other places of cultural glory, underwent an education and instruction by the church in the course of which they learned to appreciate the greatness of ancient art and literature, philosophy and science, administration and legislation and tried to appropriate them and to adapt them to their faith.

Thus a new culture emerged out of this fusion. However, this magnificent and admirable harmonization suffered from one great evil. The treasure of ancient beauty and wisdom contaminated the Christian soul on an ever-increasing scale. The hidden pagan spirit poisoned the sublimity of the Christian vision and obscured the purity of the Christian conscience. This spirit conflicting with the divine message of the Gospel as it necessarily did, slowly and inadvertently penetrated into all thoughts and all institutions of medieval society; even the See of Rome itself was not spared. The display of artistic beauty, the enormous luxury of the buildings, the frivolous life of the cardinals and even of the pope himself, aroused the anger and indignation of devout and honest visitors to Rome and among them the young Luther who thus in a very lively and realistic way learned how deeply the Roman system was corrupted in his own time.

The Roman Church was paganized to a degree. Habits of the

mythological religions; philosophical ideas not in agreement with the biblical vision of God and creation; political ambitions and even military campaigns dishonoring the very seat of Christendom; superstitious elements encroaching upon the cult, the Christian doctrine and the Christian faith. The appeasement of ancient culture by its adaptation to the spirit of the Gospel entailed—as appeasement always does—an ever-increasing power for the enemy: the pagan elements within the Christian civilization were strengthened until the entire system was threatened by secularization.

In antiquity religion and culture had been harmoniously united because religion was not yet spiritual. The pagans did not yet know the chasm between God and the sinful world, between the eternal and the temporal, between the secular and the holy. They did not yet know the very concept "secular."

THE PROTESTANT SYSTEM

The Reformation intended to reform the secularized church of the Middle Ages, to renew and recover the holiness and purity of the Gospel community, to reconvert the Christian society, to purge the Christian civilization. This intention was not yet fully evident in the beginning; at least its full consequences, its reach, its immensity, were not yet visible when Luther set out to protest against some misuses. But in the long run it became clearer and clearer.

When he left the monastery, and disclaimed the very idea of a monastery, he did so because his conscience was not satisfied with the spiritual constitution of the Roman Church. He felt that the segregation of the monks, their works of penitence and their harsh life, were no substitute for a community in which every one lived in accordance with the model of Christ. He felt that the separation of a certain class of Christians from the rest could not bring about the sanctification of the whole.

Luther departed from the idea of a differentiation between layman and priest, and thus broke the very backbone of the medieval order. The whole organization of life designed and maintained by the church was doomed. The Reformation was a radical

and a total rejection of that synthesis between antiquity and Christianity, of the reconciliation between paganism and the Gospel, which had its sway since the third century of the Christian era. It was a solemn protest, as the word Protestantism implies. It was a thorough abdication from the ecclesiastical interpretation of redemption and salvation. This protest, this abdication, had the deepest effects as it had the deepest roots. It deprived the church of its mundane privileges and prerogatives. It put aside the presumptions of a special holiness assigned to office and rank and recovered the idea that holiness is the character of the inner man alone. It cancelled the idea of an institutional guarantee for the forgiving of sin and thereby destroyed completely the power of the Roman priesthood over the soul of the believer. But this protest is only the negative part of the Reformation, only its purging action. The new solution was not merely destructive, it was eminently constructive. The Reformers did not only say: No; they also and most emphatically introduced their own system which was supposed to cure the ills by strengthening the inner substance of the Gospel message. The Reformation not only protested but it insisted upon evangelism and evangelization, and it is this positive and constructive element which makes the Reformation the greatest event in the history of the Christian Church and of Christendom altogether.

The new solution had to solve the old problem: how can a Christian civilization avoid the pitfall of appeasement, and reconcile the Word of God to a repugnant and stubborn race of fallen men? In some way such a reconciliation had to take place, if the Gospel was to be more than a lofty image of an ideal community, more than a pious dream of enthusiastic and courageous leaders; if the kingdom of heaven was to be not only a promise and a hope, but also an active force within the actual life of the individual as well as within the society, a real power daily transforming the sinner and building up a community of saints as Jesus had commanded it. Without such a transformation the Reformation would have been at best an intellectual movement, a theological doctrine, but not a rejuvenation of faith, not a dynamic in state and life, in

all relationships between man and man, in family and in business, in school and education, in scientific thinking and in artistic creation.

How did the Reformers tackle this most difficult problem? How did they fulfill the demand and the promise of Christ without either falling back in the errors of the Roman system, or disavowing absolutely all secular interests, as the early disciples had done? How did they conquer civilization without regulating its institutions by the authority of a new Pope? How did they maintain the principle of a universal Christendom and yet abandon the evasive solution of different strata of holiness? How did they succeed in establishing a democratic Christian community in which every member had the same claim and the same opportunity to be a disciple of Christ?

The program of the Reformers was as simple as it was radical. They declared categorically that there is no substitute for the kingdom of God on earth and that the visible institution of the church is as much exposed to sin and corruption as is every other human institution; that no guarantee for redemption and for the forgiving of sin can be given by whatever office and investiture; that there is no authority on earth like that presumed by the Pope. Instead the kingdom of God is entirely invisible and only thus it is the kingdom not of man, but of God. The church is merely the instrument through which God has offered and is offering His grace and love. The church is not exempt from temptation and error, although it is the only institution in the world dedicated to Christ, the only one which is committed to carrying on the work of Christ and to penetrating the souls of people with the spirit of His work.

APPRAISAL AND PROSPECT

This new solution certainly has grandeur. No one who knows the Gospel can doubt that this solution is more in line with the message than the Catholic system had been. The humility and inwardness of Jesus Himself is taken as the pattern for that kind of Christendom which the Reformers had in mind and which they

wanted to generate. The idea that every single human soul is directly under the care and charity of God; that salvation cannot be assured by any action of the priest or the Pope, but only by the free grace of the Lord; that no works of penitence by themselves can absolve the sinner, but only inner repentance and a contrite heart; that the kingdom of heaven is entirely spiritual and that God alone knows who does and who does not belong to it—all this is so evidently in agreement with the spirit and letter of the New Testament that only ignorance or bad will can dispute its truth.

It was a tremendous deed to bring this truth to light and to fight for it. Only now the plain content of St. Paul's apostolic teaching was discovered and was made alive in the Christian conscience and faith. As Protestants we have vowed and we will vow to the last minute of our life that this is the truth. If necessary we must be prepared to undergo martyrdom in order to uphold this truth. Such a possibility is no longer as unrealistic today as it might have seemed at the beginning of this century. However, in spite of this unshakable vow we must not be blind to the deficiencies of the Protestant system as a whole and to the dangers to which it is subject in our present time. As I indicated before the problem concerning the relation between culture and faith is not yet solved, and the events and movements of the twentieth century illuminate and illustrate the deficiencies of the Protestant solution better than any hostile critic could do. This does not mean that the development of recent history has taught us we should return to the Roman system. By no means; the deficiencies of Protestant civilization do not white-wash the deficiencies of the Roman system. Such a conclusion would be absurd.

While the Catholic solution went too far in the unification of culture and faith by appeasing the inheritance of antiquity; while the synthesis of the temporal and the eternal was too temporal in that solution; while the identification of the visible and the invisible church was too worldly and too humanistic, the Protestant solution went too far in the opposite direction. While the Middle Ages harmed the purity of the original message and perverted the sincerity of the believers, modern times endanger the actuality of the

temporal agent of Christ by its radical spiritualization. The Protestant system goes so far in its separation of God and World, in its demand of perfection and holiness, that an unbearable tension between the extremes may arise leading to a complete secularization of civilization. In the last two centuries this danger continually increased. On the one hand orthodox theology stiffened so that only a few could sincerely stick to it, on the other hand culture more and more emancipated itself and cut the bond with the church and with faith. In the end our culture can hardly claim still to be Christian.

We are consequently torn in two. What was exaggerated by the Roman Church, was underrated by the Reformation. To be sure, the Reformers themselves avoided the danger, because the medieval reality could not be erased in a few years or decades; on the contrary it stood for a long time, though only in remnants and fragments. Only after centuries of Protestant rule and power has the disintegration of the medieval unity proceeded so far that the seriousness of the cultural consequences of the Reformation is now fully disclosed. It is not yet seen by every one because the ideas and principles of the Reformation released cultural forces which are so imposing and impressive that mankind was, and is still understandably proud of having achieved such wonderful works in so many fields, especially in the field of scientific investigation and technological invention. Modern culture is to a great extent the direct outcome of the Reformation; without the Reformation the human mind would never have employed the audacity and creativity characteristic of the last four hundred years. But even so the greatness and boldness of this culture should not conceal the worm which gnaws at its foundations.

I will give a few examples. The separation of the sciences from sacred theology was one of the effects of the Reformation and its new conception of the relation between culture and faith. Since the whole idea of an ecclesiastical authority dominating all spheres of human activity and creativity was abandoned, the scientist felt free to investigate nature without regard to any official cosmology promoted by the church. Thus modern discoveries, ex-

periments and theories were indirectly encouraged and supported by the new conception on which Protestant culture is based. But the same separation and deliverance of the sciences produced a rivalry between faith and knowledge, between scientific and religious interpretations of nature and man. Thus the Protestant man was divided against himself. Pagan or atheistic views showed up and attacked the religious convictions.

The separation of the fine arts from their former religious background and bondage produced an ever increasing anti-Christian spirit in the realm of poetry, music and painting, Whereas the works of the fifteenth century still expressed Christian devotion and piety, in the sixteenth century the masterpieces of Italian architecture, sculpture and painting no longer conformed with this religious feeling. Poetry and music had a similar though more restrained development. Finally an aestheticism appeared in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries entirely estranged from any Christian tradition and bordering on libertinism or perversion.

The separation of state and church can be regarded as a safeguard against religious intolerance and persecution, but it also led to the paganization of political methods and finally to a thoroughly anti-Christian ideology which preaches that the state exists merely for its own sake and that the individual has no claim or right whatever. A new tyranny arose on the basis of this ideology more brutal and effective than any known in pre-Christian times.

So we find ourselves in the middle of the twentieth century in a situation which cries out for a new type of reformation. No one today sees any light that could cure these evils, but this we do see, that the direction in which modern culture developed, has led into an impasse. The old problem, how to combine both cultural creativity and evangelical faith is as severe and its solution is as uncertain as it was at the end of the Middle Ages. Mankind faces the necessity of a new attempt at a reconciliation of the opposites. Let us hope that out of the tragic and embarrassing circumstances of the present a deeper and better culture will arise in which the truth of the Reformation is preserved, but in which the dangerous and fatal consequences of modern times will be avoided.

Jesus, John, Paul (Part II)

Anton Fridrichsen

JOHN AND PAUL stand beside each other in the New Testament as the interpreters of the reality of the resurrection in the early church. For a long time it was the fashion to describe an evolutionary process in early Christianity according to the pattern: Jesus (synoptics)—Paul—John, representing John as the high point of the Hellenization of Christianity. In this theory John stands on the shoulders of Paul and continues his purpose insofar as Paul too Hellenized the historical Jesus. For Paul was less interested in the historic Jesus than in a dogma of the Resurrection Christ—John made a dogma of the human Jesus even before the resurrection and thus completed the radical Hellenization of the gospel.

This evolutionary scheme has proved itself an untenable hypothesis. John does not depend on Paul. Rather he belongs to a tradition which has its roots in Jerusalem, ultimately in an intimate fellowship with Jesus. It is on this tradition, and on the interpretation and form it received in the Ephesian church, that his gospel is based. John, thus, does not stand on the shoulders of Paul, but beside him as an independent interpreter of Christ in the church. His interpretation follows other directions than the Pauline. The difference relates both to form and theological structure, and it is easy to see how the form and content depend on each other. Paul develops the idea of righteousness in the New Covenant, and naturally uses the form of a letter or treatise. John was confronted by another task. His concern was to connect the content of the Christian faith and the religious experience of the congregation with the historical foundation of faith, with the person and deeds of Jesus in the flesh. He is anti-gnostic, and his main purpose is to make clear the unity between the risen, glorified Lord and the Word Incarnate, the Jesus of Galilee and Jerusalem. For

his purpose the gospel was the most natural and suitable form. John gives, therefore, an interpretation of Jesus which shows how the faith of the church and its religious experience are bound up with what Jesus said and did as the Messiah of Israel. This is how John understood the reality of the Resurrection. How does it compare with the substance of Paul's interpretation?

There is no necessity of elaborating on the differences—they are manifest. Nor is it essential to point out similarities on this or that point. The important question is, can we find a central consensus in the original theologians of the church, such a consensus as bears witness to a common foundation?

The basic words in Paul are *faith and righteousness,* in John, *faith and* (*eternal*) *life.* Both deal with the eschatological reality of Christ, created through the deed of Jesus, his death and resurrection, presented through the gospel, the Word in the church, within the sacramental fellowship of the congregation in its unity with the Risen One. This is the central consensus of Paul and John, and we can hold that "life" in the meaning of John and "righteousness" in Paul are two expressions of the same thing, with only differing emphasis. In both cases it is a question of the relationship of the fallen and lost humanity with its Creator, a relationship which is a gift through faith in the Son, Jesus Christ. It is a relationship which man receives and possesses in the personal living relationship of the Son. The opposite pole is the same in Paul and John—unbelief, judgment, and death. Both present the same alternatives, and in an eschatological sense, that is, they are explicable in terms of the Christ history and only thus.

"Righteousness" and "life" are concepts and realities which in the Old Testament are identical. The righteous is the one who with all his heart lives in the Covenant and possesses life in oneness with God and his people—peace and blessing flow through him and all that he is. Here is neither former nor latter—righteousness is life and life is righteousness. Judaism developed a sharper differentiation between the terms when it related righteousness to the commandments and made life a reward of resurrection for a righteousness earned by obedience to the law. But

in the eschatological people of God, in the church, we find the organic relationship between righteousness and life restored again on a new foundation. They now are one "in Christ." In his polemic against the Jews (and Judaizers) who seek righteousness and life outside of Christ, Paul does to a large extent use juridical thought forms, but this should not obscure the fact that for him righteousness is centrally anchored in the Covenant, the New Covenant, a reality of faith created by God in Christ and present in the Gospel. For Paul too righteousness meant a complete incorporation in the covenant, a being "in Christ." And since the righteousness of God consists in his creation of the Christ reality, the righteousness which the believer receives in Christ is God's own righteousness, God's own life in and through Christ.

In reality the Pauline and the Johannine lines converge. The differences in form, terminology, and structure depend on the variation in message which derived from the difference in the historical situation and the qualifications of the interpreters. Paul, a one-time Pharisee learned in Scripture, was in combat with Judaism; John, rooted in the tradition of Jesus, raised a bulwark against a spiritualized Gnosis. The battlefront of John is suggested in the closing words of his gospel (20:21): "These (signs) are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." Faith is to believe in Jesus as the Son of God, faith in the Incarnate Word. Faith is to believe that he, man among men, is the Anointed of God, the Saviour. This historical person, Jesus of Nazareth in Galilee, is the foundation and the substance of faith. Witness to him creates faith (17:20). This is clear: the accent in John is on a different place than in Paul. Still there is no real divergence between them, for both treat of the one and the same, indivisible eschatological event relating to Jesus, his life, death, and resurrection. Within this totality Paul and John accent different elements, but all the while they start from the whole and take the whole into account. It is even worthy of note that for John the "Jews" represent lack of faith—they refuse to recognize Jesus as the one sent of God, that is they refuse to recognize him as the

agent of the positive eschatological happening and to place themselves within it. Essentially this is just what Paul says about the Jews, that they would not give up their righteousness and receive the righteousness of God in Christ (Romans 10:3).

Finally it must be pointed out that both in Paul and in John it is Jesus that is presented as the image according to which the member of the new people of God shall be formed. It is not a matter of mechanical *imitatio,* but of obedience to his will and example, in a fellowship of faith and love with him, with his image ever before the eye. The image is not to be copied, but it and the new commandment will be effective and through the work of the Spirit in heart and in congregation the faithful and obedient become the followers of Jesus. "If any man serve me, let him follow me" (John 12:27). "If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples" (John 8:31)—the "word" of Jesus is his historical revelation. God has "foreordained" us "to be conformed to the image of his son, that he might be the first born among many brethren" (Romans 8:29, cf. II Corinthians 3:18). Neither John nor Paul could have written words such as these if they had not had the image of the historical Jesus, as it existed in his words, deeds, and suffering, as the living background for all their thoughts and doctrines of the faith, or if that image were not the source of those thoughts and doctrines.

We have no definite information on Paul's picture of Jesus. We do have John's picture of Jesus, and it is necessary for us to ascertain how it compares with that of the synoptics. The problem of John and the synoptic gospels is one of the greatest and most important of the problems of modern biblical research. Ever since it was raised around 1770 it has ceaselessly occupied theology and the church and kept alive a discussion which even to our own times has been characterized by sharp divergences. The debate about John is still in full force without any definite solution in sight. Yet, there have been results. Though this gospel continues to present difficult riddles incapable probably of being solved we may claim that we are in the process of achieving a theory of the

Fourth Gospel which is both critical and positive. We cannot here give a full discussion and explanation, but merely a brief summary of this approach.

A former generation considered it obvious that in comparison with the synoptics the gospel of John was altogether secondary. The life and teaching of Jesus are to be found in the gospel of Mark and in the Logia sources of Matthew and Luke. When we come to John we do not find history but a theological theory based on and derived from certain synoptic themes. The evangelist has sought to describe the acts and proclamation of Jesus, and his death and resurrection, in forms and terms which corresponded to his own religious ideas and experience. Jesus thus speaks John's own words and proclaims his thoughts. The narratives are suffused with Johannine Christ-mysticism and speculations and thus given a sort of double meaning, a symbolic-allegorical character not to be taken as real historical happenings. Throughout, the theological ideas of the evangelist, or of the circle of John, are apparent, and when it is here and there indirectly suggested that the manuscript is the work of one of the disciples and closest friends of Jesus, this is interpreted as a literary device designed to give the book the highest possible rank and authority. Thus the gospel of John does not belong to the writings of history except as a factor and document in the history of dogma. The evangelist, or his circle, has carried the Pauline theology further in the direction of mysticism, purified it of Jewish characteristics and set it in the universal perspective of the Greek logos philosophy.

This critical analysis of the gospel of John is founded on observations which are irrefutable. But it is a question of the proper conclusions to be drawn from them.

It certainly cannot be denied that the synoptics give us a strictly "historical" picture of Jesus in the sense that the parables and the Sermon on the Mount and the descriptions of specific events bring us right into the reality which was directly created by Jesus through word and deed. This is the way it happened, thus he spoke and acted. That the presentation of John is strongly, even

radically, affected by a certain point of view, cannot be doubted. But does this mean that the Fourth gospel is not "historical"?

This question has begun to affect the modern research in the gospel of John. The development in this area is of utmost interest. We are in the midst of a change in the way we see things, a change which extends far beyond the Johannine problem. It affects our attitude toward and judgment of the *whole* tradition of Jesus, of all biblical tradition, in fact of all the tradition of religion in antiquity as a whole. What is the nature of this change?

It is difficult to describe in a few, brief sentences. But it has to do with the break-up of the nineteenth century's idea of history, and its "historicism." Characteristic of this idea was its evolutionism, its idealism of the individual personality, and connected with both these "isms," its relativism. When it was confronted by a historical document of antiquity, it sought above all to find the "authentic" material—dependable biographical data which would make possible a description of the circumstances, the character and opinions of people. It was considered of importance to learn to know the milieu and the creative and formative elements in an era. The individual and personal and variant are pictured in an environment which is a product of various biological forces of nature, forces which urge on the "development" in a certain observable direction. The task of historical research is to explain the variant and the individual in their interaction with the biological and environmental factors. The application of this method to the study of Jesus naturally leads to amazing results. A portrait of Jesus emerged which was nothing else than a self-portrait of the idealized nineteenth-century person. Over against such a portrait Paul and John appeared as founders of a new religion, wholly different from that represented by Jesus. Peeling off the synoptic tradition one came to a historic kernel consisting of a few facts and a dozen words of Jesus—everything else is secondary stuff, a product of the theology of the church.

Gradually, however, the conviction has grown that this is not the way to learn to understand ancient oriental religious documents and to penetrate to their religious realities. One can never

imprison in our western categories either a prophet of Israel, a Jewish Messiah, or his environment. The man of God is never isolated. He is always the center of a circle which lives on his words and example and in which he lives on in tradition after his death. What is told, said, and written in the circle comes ultimately from the person in the center and carries his life and nature. If we of a later generation and children of a different culture wish to form an idea of such a person and his age, we have to go to the tradition with our questions, but go with understanding of its nature, a peculiar oriental nature. Only in such understanding can we judge of the value of a tradition as a source of history. But one cannot attain to such an understanding without insight into the customs and conduct of the prophet's circle in ancient Israel and in a messianic Judaism. One then soon learns that tradition is an extraordinary source of history, if by "history" we mean a group life, gathered around, dominated and pervaded by, a person possessing in himself a source of religious power. But one discovers also that he cannot make such a person the object of a biography, a psychological character study. He was not an individualist in consciousness and behavior, his soul was of a structure not western. If we are to comprehend him it will be only by studying the marks he left in the group life, and in the tradition there formed and preserved and since constantly continued.

This naturally does not mean that on principle one must desist from seeking to discern earlier and later levels of tradition, or by critical study and reflection to establish all possible facts and statements inseparably connected with the object of research. But it does mean that one may not imagine that in so doing one is reaching the real nature of the prophet. This we can grasp only if we observe how he was experienced, described, quoted, how he was spoken of, and always in the group of which he was the soul, because he did not possess his soul for himself, but gave himself to those who took to themselves his word, and nature, and will. From the viewpoint of the demands placed on modern biography, that which can be recounted of the old oriental men of God must appear extremely unsatisfactory, loose and uncertain and marked

by great gaps both in the historical description and in the personal characterization. But if we have been emancipated from the narrow horizon of historicism and its meager experience of reality we find just in tradition with its richness and color and variety the mirror in which historical reality reflects itself. What has been said here in general applies specifically to a long series of biblical personages, Isaiah and Jeremiah as well as Jesus and John the Baptist.

From this standpoint the question of the Fourth Gospel assumes this form—does the gospel of John contain genuine tradition, or is it a pseudo-tradition, the product of intentional fabrication of history? To state the question is to answer it. The Fourth Gospel has an independent historical value as over against the synoptics—research is now practically unanimous on this point. Nor is there reason to doubt that the Johannine logia-tradition originated and was formulated in Jesus' own group of disciples. It came into being in the company of the Master and through the inspiration of his person and teaching.

If, as seems probable, Peter has impressed his character on the synoptic tradition, John, the disciple of Jesus—whether apostle or presbyter makes no essential difference—has given us the core of the Fourth Gospel. The literary shape, which we meet in the New Testament, may be granted to be the final result of several decades of the tradition's history with oral narration and instruction and written matter as stages therein. But it is not within our power to reconstruct the stages previous to the gospel of John as we now have it. All such attempts end up as arbitrary hypotheses. We can only assert certain traces of the gathering and editing of material. But even in the final literary form the spiritual unity with the original is preserved. The editors have not departed from the line which leads from the source to this one or those who moulded the tradition into its final form, making of it a well-rounded history of Jesus crystallized in a literary document. The evangelist himself has been filled with and dominated by his material, and the form he gives to it therefore accords fully with its inner nature and the means at hand to express it.

The gospel of John, deeply impressed as it is by the ideas and terminology of the disciple whom Jesus loved and of his church, is thus an authentic historical witness to Jesus. The evangelist seeks to give a portrait of Jesus as he had received and taken it over from eye-witnesses, and as it lived on in the church to which he belonged.

The question of "John and the synoptics" can therefore not be dismissed by considering the gospel of John as of secondary historical value or as a production of a later generation's mysticism and speculation. Both the synoptics and John give us a picture of Jesus which stems originally from personal observation, experience, and meeting. The same person, the same historical reality, is reflected and lives on in both branches of the tradition. Each is of equal value as a source of our knowledge of Jesus, of what he claimed to be and of what he wanted. One complements the other. John gives the deeper background of the synoptic picture of Jesus. In the latter the messianic idea and the concept of the Son of Man predominate. But what was in the heart of Jesus as he spoke and lived as Messiah and the Son of Man comes to light in the Johannine description of the Son whom the Father sends to complete his work in the world. In this view it is clear that the proper historical use of John cannot consist of a simple combination of the Fourth Gospel and the synoptics. The two pictures must stand beside each other, each by itself. *But they can be seen together.* Then the light will reveal the one, unified historical reality.

F. C. Baur interpreted the history of the Early Church in terms of a dialectical movement between opposites which found a higher unity in the creation of the Catholic Church. At the turn of the century theology, characterized by an evolutionary view of history, a psychological methodology and an idealistic concept of personality, explained the early history of Christianity as a rapid Hellenization of the Gospel, though granting the mighty religious-ethical personality of Jesus a continued influence in the quiet inner sanctuary of a Christian personality. What has the

most recent epoch of biblical research put in its place? The eschatological view of history, which places Jesus Christ and the church in an organic and indissoluble unity.

The genius of Albert Schweitzer dealt the death-blow to liberalism's philosophy of history, when he showed that both Jesus and Paul have the same dogmatic foundation—the Messianic. Thereby he revealed the organic relationship between Christ and his apostle. Paul drew the conclusions of the history of Jesus, interpreting its significance with apostolic authority. Schweitzer, it is true, is guilty of strong one-sidedness and gross distortions when he develops his thesis in detail. He makes Jesus to be a desperate apocalyptic fanatic who provoked his own death in order to force the transcendental realization of the kingdom of God, the end of the world, the final judgment and the new creation. In his view Paul becomes an eschatological mystic, for whom the life and teaching of Jesus had no significance—the only thing that mattered was the supernatural sacramental life which after the resurrection might be mediated by Christ to the faithful. John is a pure mystic and has lost all connection with the historic Jesus. His gospel is the myth which gives the content and character of the Christian mystery. Paul, even in his new experience remains entirely on the foundation of Judaism, John is altogether a Hellenist. But even these misinterpretations are outweighed by the fundamental contribution Schweitzer made when he overturned the modern artificial constructions and brought New Testament research back to biblical realities. He was not the first to see and emphasize the eschatological orientation of the New Testament. But he was the first to glimpse the immense consequences which the eschatological interpretation would have for biblical research and all theology. He is deserving, therefore, of a place in the history of theology beside Baur as a pioneer in the study of the historical problem of early Christianity.

We are still in the first stages of this study, even though it has already given rise to a comprehensive and rich history. It now is a century old—Baur sketched his view for the first time in a brief treatise in 1831. But the history of biblical interpretation is

so intimately and variously connected with the development and transformation of the whole spiritual situation that a long time is required before the new ripens, clarifies, and reveals all its consequences. In our day we are witnessing the beginning of a new epoch in biblical scholarship which will have important results for the church's view and use of the Bible. We are living in a period of transition both in the practical and the theological aspects of religion, and are experiencing its cloudiness and confusion but also the encouragement and the hopefulness which come with new approaches. What is then the tendency now visible on the frontiers of biblical study?

There is a search for the *unity,* the fundamental unity of the Bible. But this unit is not an identity. On the contrary, faith wants clearly to see the distinctions, the continuity, the formation of the new, that is, the history, the unceasing events, the reality in movement and in transformation. In brief what concerns us is the eschatological fulfillment in the stages of its preparation, its realization in Jesus Christ, and its interpretation in the church. It now appears that all the New Testament falls within this framework and that all its books belong in it and together form a whole.

Once we have seen this we will by inner necessity come to view the problem of the history of early Christianity differently than does liberal theology. This does not mean that we need to deny or abstain from those principles underlying all modern scientific historical research—principles of literary criticism, of the history of religion and culture, of psychology. We shall find use for all of them as we seek to form a picture of the inner and outer development of early Christianity in the apostolic and post-apostolic times, that is, the period of the New Testament. But we will grasp the continuity of this history and the inner power of what happens neither in a religious and cultural historical process such as Hellenism nor in a religious-ethical personality ideal in its individual manifestations, but in an on-living and on-working Jesus who is in his church, his body on earth. The New Testament is a churchly book, a book of the church, and he who uses it to create and nourish for himself a private religion misuses his Bible. He

promotes that view of early Christianity which there finds a variety of religious types among whom one must choose—Jesus or Paul, the synoptics or John. A Jesus conceived in the categories of personality idealism cannot possibly make of the New Testament a unity. We have to understand Jesus as one with his church, his body on earth, if we are to perceive and experience the New Testament gospel as one and indivisible.

Harnack maintained that there were two gospels in the New Testament—the gospel of the Father and the gospel of the Saviour Son. We have asserted that this thesis is not tenable. The gospel in the New Testament is one, and it is essential that this be maintained against this form of dualism. Conviction of the unity of the New Testament necessarily means a breaking through the boundaries of Rationalism's philosophy of history and an adoption of the eschatological message. It would be possible to show in a scientifically plausible way that Jesus, John and Paul belong to the same eschatological reality. But the rationalism of Western thought and its conception of reality is so deeply rooted in us and so determinative for our immediate reaction to all reality, that we must ever anew forcibly free ourselves from it and overcome it in order rightly to read the New Testament. In general it is true that Western biblical Christianity must continuously be in combat with the legacy of Hellas. Our aim must be to keep Jesus of Nazareth in unity with the Christ of dogma and of liturgy and to perceive this unity throughout the New Testament. This one does not learn in private with his Bible, nor in the closed circle of the conventicle, but only in the fellowship of the holy ecumenical church.

The problem of early Christianity is the question concerning the unity of the New Testament. This unity does not consist in tracing in the different parts of the New Testament some common idea or ideal which is more or less clearly recognized in and back of the confessions of the Early Church as religious and ethical "after effects" of Jesus religious and ethical personality. This unity is the Lord himself in his oneness with his church. The variety in the New Testament ought not then be seen as a religious

problem, a difficulty for faith. On the contrary it means immense riches. And it will be found so when we maintain that the one Lord speaks in all Scripture through the one church. After his departure he speaks still through that church which was the fruit of his life, death, and resurrection. In all its varying forms—some arising already in the Early Church—this church is bound to its living Lord by Word (tradition), Spirit, and sacrament and thus amid all variations is:

> One body and one Spirit,
> One Lord, one faith, one baptism.

The question of the unity of the New Testament is the question of the *unity of the church in the Early Church.* The old method of research which compared concepts, formulations, beliefs, and credal statements must go deeper and learn to judge these as upwellings and revelations of a common but richly differentiated faith and life of the one church. We shall then also find many more common elements than could be discovered before. But of more importance is the fact that we then will see the unity in the multiplicity and therefore in the multiplicity find the indisputable evidence of the historical reality of the New Testament.

Msgr. Knox's Old Testament in English

Charles M. Cooper

WHO is this Msgr. Roland A. Knox who has translated the entire Bible from the Vulgate Latin edition into contemporary literary English in recent years? His New Testament first appeared in 1945; the first of two volumes containing the Old Testament was finished on the Feast of St. Jerome, September 30, 1948; the complete Bible, by 1949. As we learn from one of the translator's inimitable essays, gathered in his *Trials of a Translator,* the whole task was performed in "Nine Years' Hard"; i.e., nine years' hard labor was the sentence his effort imposed upon him!

The British *Who's Who* informs us that Ronald A. Knox is the fourth son of an Anglican bishop. He won a first-class honors degree in Classics at Balliol College, Oxford, in 1910 and thereafter was a fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, until received into the Church of Rome in 1917. An Oxford don; a convert to Catholicism! That, you will say, explains a great deal. For a dozen years, 1926-1939, Father Knox was Catholic chaplain at Oxford and in 1941 Trinity College elected him an honorary fellow. That, it seems to me, explains a great deal more. One has only to read his very wise and witty essays referred to above to become aware of his charm, his brilliance, his solid scholarship, broad humanity, and vigorous mind. A few sentences from the preface to his essays will give you some idea of the man.

"All my life (he says) I had been indifferent to the use of titles; complete strangers referred to me, sometimes in my hearing, as 'Ronnie Knox'—if anything, it was the surname that was regarded as optional. Then I published a translation of the New Testament, and all at once I found I had gone back to my schooldays; I was simply 'Knox.' Moffat said this, Knox said that; I had become one of these translator-fellows." The effect of mononymity, he says, can be achieved without getting into trouble

with the police: you have only to translate the Bible! The kind of man who brilliantly begins an academic and ecclesiastic career at Oxford, switches to the Catholic Church, but returns as Catholic chaplain and by an honorary fellowship is reclaimed for his college, from which his conversion has legally severed his association —that is one kind one inevitably feels so interested in as to refer to him as a personal friend, as "Ronnie Knox."

The particular work of Msgr. Knox which I wish to consider here is his translation of the Old Testament, appearing in two volumes, 1948-1949. The first volume includes the books, Genesis-Esther, the second, Job-Machabees.

This latter, ending with II Machabees (to which a version of the New Latin Psalter of the Pontifical Biblical Institute has been appended) makes one aware, first of all, that the Old Testament of the Catholic Bible includes what Protestants call the Apocrypha, which neither Jews nor Protestants acknowledge as Holy Scripture. Notice of the appendix, with its alternative version of the Psalms, raises two other distinctions between Msgr. Knox's translation and Protestant Bibles which will concern us here. Msgr. Knox differs even from fellow Catholics in regarding the whole Old Testament, in English, as a prose work. He explains (in an essay printed in his *Trials* from an article in the *Clergy Review*) that to print parts of the Old Testament as poetry, in broken lines, costs one page to every ten in space; and he contends that anyway, the ordinary English reader does not understand by "poetry" the particular literary forms employed as such in Hebrew. Hence both his translations of Psalms, as well as of all other Old Testament poetical passages, are in prose. And also it is to be observed that what Msgr. Knox is translating is St. Jerome's Latin translation of the original Hebrew and Greek of the Old Testament and Apocrypha. The relation of the Vulgate text to the originals of which it is an early fifth century translation, must therefore be taken into account. Beyond these three matters of canon, literary form and text, I think it natural to discuss whether or not there are evidences of Catholic doctrine in this work of Msgr. Knox; and as Americans we ought also to

bear in mind the British character of Msgr. Knox's English vocabulary and style. These are the topics I shall discuss.

First, then, the Catholic Old Testament canon as compared with the Protestant. Both of these can best be understood in the light of the more ancient Jewish canon. The word canon derives from *kanon,* a loan-word in Greek from the Hebrew *qaneh,* a rod or a measure. The canon of Scripture, then, is the list of Holy Scriptures accepted as the rule. It varies with each of these groups, both as to order and content.

The Jews accept, of course, only the Old Testament. And with them, this includes three distinct categories: 1) the Law (i.e., the Pentateuch, or five-fold work of Moses: viz., Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy); 2) the Prophets (both Former Prophets: viz., Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings; and Latter Prophets: viz., Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and The Twelve —i.e., the Minor Prophets); and 3) the Writings (Job, Psalms, Proverbs, the five Megilloth, i.e., rolls read at feasts and fasts of the sacred calendar: viz., Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes and Esther, and the books of Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah —counted as one, as are also I and II Chronicles). This amounts to a list of twenty-four Scriptures: five books of the Law; eight books of Prophets—four former and four latter; and eleven books of Writings—three large poetical books and five small books, plus Daniel and the two works of the Chronicler: Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles.

These names, although not the proper Hebrew titles of the books, are accepted in the English version of The Holy Scriptures, published since 1917 by the Jewish Publication Society of America. They accord most closely, of course, with the familiar Protestant designations. Actually, they are a mixture, as titles. Most derive from the Greek Bible: thus Genesis, or Deuteronomy, for example. Others, like Chronicles, are found only in modern languages; this particular title comes from a suggestion made by St. Jerome in one of his Prefaces. The spellings, as of Joshua and Isaiah, e.g., are due to the Old Testament translators of the King James Bible. They do not occur in the New Testament until the English Re-

vised Version of 1881. In the Authorized Version we still spell and pronounce *Isaiah* in the Old Testament, but *Esaias* in the New; *Elijah,* but *Elias;* Saul son of *Kish,* but Saul son of *Cis,* and so forth.

The Catholic Bible is more consistent here, as are also the various revised and modern versions by Protestants. But it will be sufficient to cite the Catholic Old Testament canon to illustrate the Latinized spellings of proper names. According to decree of the Council of Trent, Fourth Session, the Old Testament canonical books are: five of Moses (Genesis-Deuteronomy); then Josue, Judges, Ruth and four of Kings (1st and 2d Kings are the Jewish and Protestant books of Samuel), two of Paralipomena (a Greek title for Chronicles, meaning, "the things omitted"—i.e., in Samuel and Kings which they so largely parallel), first and second Esdras (the 2d also called Nehemias); then Tobias, Judith and Esther. These, comprehended in Knox's first volume, comprise the historical books. They number nineteen and include in Tobias and Judith two books which Jews and Protestants account as Apocryphal, and in Esther some additional chapters of the same character. Then come Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, the Book of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus (these last two, again, are apocryphal to others than Catholics. We know Wisdom as The Wisdom of Solomon; and Ecclesiasticus, sometimes, especially among Jews, as the Wisdom of Sirach or of Jesus Ben Sira); finally the prophets include Isaiah, Jeremias, with the Lamentations of Jeremias and the Prophecy of Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, the twelve minor prophets, viz., Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Michaeas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggaeus, Zacharias and Malachias) and, finally, the first and second books of Machabees. These last two and Baruch with its sixth chapter and the supplements to Daniel are all relegated to the Protestant Apocrypha. Of secondary, non-canonical character, and printed at the conclusion of the New Testament (on which Catholic and Protestant Bibles have no differences) are the Prayer of Manasse and third and fourth Esdras. These Knox does not translate. But they are to be found in Protestant editions of the Apocrypha which list

the following: First and Second Esdras (which are the Catholic third and fourth Esdras, respectively), Tobit, Judith, Chapters 10-16 of Esther, The Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus; Baruch, with the Epistle of Jeremy, which is the 6th chapter of Baruch in the Catholic editions, and also indicated as such in Protestant Apocrypha; The Song of the Three Holy Children, which appears *in* Chapter 3 of the Catholic edition of Daniel; the History of Susanna, which is chapter 13 of Daniel in the Catholic Bible; The History of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon, which is chapter 14 in the Catholic Daniel; the Prayer of Manasses, which is, as indicated, in the Catholic Apocrypha (after the New Testament) and finally, First and Second Maccabees.

The great distinction between Catholic and other (Protestant and also Jewish) Bibles is the inclusion in the former of what the latter regard as apocryphal books. The sole basis for the omission of these books in the Old Testament canon, is that they were not known, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, except in Greek and Latin translations from the Greek. Since then portions of Ecclesiasticus have been recovered in the original Hebrew and strong arguments have been advanced for supposing that at least I Maccabees was also originally in Hebrew. But the ancient Jewish and later Protestant exclusion of these books rested on the fact that their Hebrew originals were not extant. Indeed, it was St. Jerome who first pointed this out, explaining that whereas the version which finally became the Latin Vulgate Bible was made from the original Hebrew (and not, like previous Latin Bibles from the Greek), these books, now included in the Protestant Apocrypha, were not extant in Hebrew or in use among the Jews. It was on the basis of this information that Luther, first of all, relegated all the Apocrypha, including additional chapters as in Esther, or supplementary sections, as those which attach to Baruch and Daniel, to the end of the Old Testament. Of them Luther said, "these are books not to be held in equal esteem with Holy Scripture, but yet good and useful for reading." This view was adopted in English Bibles, beginning in Coverdale's 1535, the year after Luther's completed German Bible was published in

1534. Coverdale, however, retained the position of Baruch next after Jeremiah and Lamentations, because he "was Jeremiah's scribe and of his time." Since the Puritan era of the seventeenth century, however, the Apocrypha have been rejected in English Bibles and are not to be found in common editions today. Pulpit Bibles are the only exception, in the case of the Authorized Version, so far as I am aware.

Now, of course, Msgr. Knox translates the Catholic Vulgate, including in the places indicated for them, the books which Protestants generally do not read at all, as apocrypha.

Just what is an apocryphal book, in the Protestant view? It used to be thought that they were books written too late and with too little inspiration to be included in the canon. The Jewish practice of hiding away old books in what is called a *genizah,* a lumber-room, was cited to explain their transmission in Christian copies of the Scriptures of Israel, while they disappeared from Jewish Bibles. This connection seemed also to explain their discovery, in the case of Ecclesiasticus at least, in fragmentary portions written in the original Hebrew. But the Greek term *apocrypha* has nothing to do with the Jewish *genizah,* or hidden. It translates, rather, the Jewish term *hazunim: sopherim hazunim* are "outside books." They were not stored in the genizah—they were not to be read or kept by Jews at all. It is a fact that no Jewish Bible ever included any of the apocrypha. The oldest Greek texts of them occur only in Christian copies of the Old Testament in the version popularly called the Septuagint, which the Jews of the early Christian centuries repudiated and replaced by new Greek translations, never including the apocrypha.

So an apocryphal book is one not regarded as canonical by the Jews who transmitted as their own Bible the Scriptures which constitute the Old Testament. Rightly used, in this Protestant sense, the apocrypha of the Old Testament include a great many other works besides those named thus far. The Dropsie College is now engaged in editing and translating the whole extant body of what they call "Jewish Apocryphal Literature." First Maccabees and The Letter of Aristeas have thus far appeared. Works

like The Book of Jubilees, Third and Fourth Maccabees, Enoch, The Odes of Solomon, the Sybilline Oracles, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and others, will be included. This is Jewish literature of the Hellenistic and Roman ages, written by Jews, to be sure, and sometimes even in Hebrew, but never gaining acceptance as Holy Scripture among Jews. It is of great human interest and historical importance. As such, modern Jewish scholars are interested in it. But none of it is regarded by them as canonical. Protestants accept their view of it. Catholics take another view of such books of this kind as have traditionally appeared in Greek and Latin Bibles and, since the sixteenth century council of Trent, been declared to be canonical.

It may be anticipated that a renewed interest will be awakened among Protestants in the whole body of Jewish apocryphal literature. A great English edition was brought out in two volumes, in 1913, by R. H. Charles, entitled *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.* The new Dropsie edition, in separate volumes, will displace that work. Meantime, Protestants will find Msgr. Knox's translation, like Professor Goodspeed's (published in the University of Chicago Press's so-called American Translation of "The Complete Bible") very useful and convenient. Charles' two bulky volumes are not convenient. And the older translations and revisions, from the Authorized Version on down, although still obtainable from Bible houses, are not very readable. Goodspeed is an American scholar, translating with great speed into ordinary American English, accurate and readable, but without great literary distinction. As to Knox, we shall see!

Msgr. Knox, then, has translated the Catholic Old Testament. We have seen that this includes the Protestant Apocrypha, except for the Prayer of Manasses and First and Second Esdras (The Catholic 3d and 4th Esdras). Now we have to remark on his translation of all this literature into English prose. In the first place, it may be desirable to indicate that large portions of the Old Testament, in the original Hebrew, and even of the Greek Apocrypha, are in verse forms. For Knox has followed very

largely the tradition of the English Authorized Version in neglecting this fact. Perhaps I should not say he has neglected it. His essays show he is perfectly aware of it and for two reasons has chosen not to indicate it. His first reason, you may recall, was one of economy. Printing poetry as such takes too much space. This is hardly a sound reason. The Old Testament takes two volumes in the Knox translation. Why not three? The poetical parts could then be translated as poetry and printed as such and no one volume would have to be as bulky as each of the present two! But no, Msgr. Knox's real reason is not one of convenience but of principle. As he says, giving his second reason, the English reader does not think of poetry in the same way as the Hebrew writers. Their device of parallelism, by which each thought is repeated in a different way, or paralleled by an additional or even an opposite thought, Knox holds, is foreign to us. I very much doubt if this is so, simply because the reading and chanting of Psalms and even their paraphrases in metrical English hymns have made the device perfectly familiar. Granted that it is a Hebrew poetical form, not native English. So are many types of classical meter, sonnet rhyme patterns, and various stanza and strophe arrangements imitated by English poets of all periods from foreign literatures. In this century of blank verse, rhythmic prose, imagist verse and other non-traditional forms, it hardly does to characterize the poetry of the psalms as different from our idea of what is poetry in English! Do all Englishmen regard Pope's rhymed pentameter couplets as the norm of poetry? I doubt it. No, Msgr. Knox's principle of translation is to repeat the Hebrew ideas, as represented, of course, by Jerome's Latin translation, in the manner in which an Englishman would express them. This renders form, as in poetry, secondary. The primary concern is supposed to be with thought. In the Psalms he actually avoids parallelism. Psalm 135 in the Vulgate (Hebrew Psalm 136) is a prime example. There the thanks due the Lord is outlined in a magnificent Credo. Every article of Israel's faith however is based upon the eternal covenant—in the AV "for his mercy endureth for ever . . . for his mercy endureth for ever." But Msgr. Knox shortens this phrase and moves it

about: now it follows the article of faith, again it precedes it. Thus he renders, ". . . give thanks to the Lord of hosts, his mercy is eternal. Eternal his mercy, who does great deeds as none else can; eternal his mercy whose wisdom made the heavens . . . made the moon and the stars to rule by night, his mercy is eternal."

The question is, does this alteration of structure, this reduction of the refrain from a causal clause, always in parallelism with the separate statements of the acts of God in creation and redemption, to a mere predication of eternal lovingkindness adequately represent the Hebrew psalmist's thought? The Psalm amounts to this, in Knox's version: "Eternal his mercy who created the world and saved Israel." But in the original it is said, "God created the world because his keeping of covenant is forever; God saved Israel because his keeping of covenant is for ever." In the first instance, Knox represents the everlasting grace of God as an attribute: "Eternal his mercy who. . . ." In the original, God's everlasting grace is the source and explanation of His creative and saving acts. I submit that Knox has missed the meaning.

But not only are the so-called Poetical Books of the Old Testament in verse—Job, Psalms, Proverbs, as well as Lamentations and the Song of Songs. Much of the prophetical discourses is also poetical in form. Isaiah properly begins with the Lord's complaint: (Authorized Version) "I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against me." Msgr. Knox renders this: ". . . my own sons, that I reared and brought to manhood, think to defy me!" I think that is quite adequate. The parallelism is lost, of course—between God's rearing sons and their unfilial behavior. But the main idea is aptly and vigorously expressed. However, Isaiah continues, regarding Israel—God's undutiful children: "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." And surely, seeing the continued antithesis of the original parallelism—sons-rebels; knowing beasts-ignorant Israel, you will grant that Msgr. Knox has nodded over the passage when he allows Isaiah to be represented as saying: "Ox recognizes its owner, ass knows the way to its master's crib; and I? I go unacknowledged; my own

people of Israel give me never a thought." Who is the next subject after ox and ass now? How does the Lord get into this mixed company? Well, the translator didn't want to express Hebrew parallelism. But he has a parallelism, antithetical as Isaiah's own, but strangely altered. From knowing beasts vs. ignorant, erring Israel he has switched the thought to knowing beasts vs. unknown, ignored God! Isaiah did not say that. It had been better to translate the prophet's ideas more exactly, as he expressed them. This would not militate against fresh English phrases. The vocabulary employed by Msgr. Knox is superlatively good. His phrases could be kept without discarding Isaiah's structure of expression: "Ox recognizes its owner, ass knows the way to its master's crib; but Israel does not acknowledge me, nor my own people give me a thought." Here Israel parallels ox and ass; God, as the prophet intended, parallels owner and master; and the acknowledgment and giving of thought to God, in Knox's excellent phrases, would properly parallel recognition of the ox's owner, and knowledge of the way to the master's crib. The determination of Msgr. Knox not to follow Hebrew parallelism of expression in poetical passages is most unfortunate. There is sound precedent in English literature for a prose translation of a poetical work. I should not have objected to translating Psalm 136 (Latin 135) without the repetition of the refrain: "Because his mercy endureth for ever—give thanks to the Lord . . . who created . . . who delivered . . . who remembers" and so on. And the resetting of lines, as in Isaiah 1:2, from parallel phrases and clauses into a main clause with a relative clause enclosed parenthetically within it: from "children I nourished . . . and they rebelled against me" to "my own sons, that I reared . . . think to defy me"—this is quite all right. But elsewhere the loss of the Hebrew significance of parallelism has cost Knox his marks. If the second half of Isaiah 1:2 rates an A, I must put down a D-minus for v. 3!

In defending himself against these same charges on the part of Catholic reviewers, Msgr. Knox makes the point that he is not translating for his professor's approval, but to be read by ordinary folk. This ought he to have done—and not to have left the other

undone—not the winning of academic points, but the exact representation in English expression of the thought of the original.

And here we must notice that the original, for Msgr. Knox, is Jerome's Vulgate Latin, not the Hebrew of psalmists and prophets. The Lord gets mixed into the parallelism with ox and ass in Isaiah, ch. 1, because Jerome inserts a pronoun there. The Hebrew says, "Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." But Jerome renders, "Israel, however, knows *me* not, and my people do not understand." This is what got Msgr. Knox off the track of Isaiah's parallelism.

Now why is this new translation into English made from the Latin, instead of from the original Hebrew? After reading large chunks and looking up many individual passages of Msgr. Knox's translation, this is the only point, apart from his inclusion of the apocryphal books, on which I have discovered him to be a Catholic. There are Jewish apologetics, if not polemics, aplenty in the English translation of the Jewish Publication Society. But I find nothing specifically Catholic in the Knox version save, first, the inclusion of what Jews and Protestants regard as Apocryphal Books, and, in the second place, making the Latin Bible the basis of the translation. That a Catholic should take most careful account of the interpretation of St. Jerome is understandable and right. It is the official Catholic Bible for any discussion of faith and morals. But that a scholar as well equipped in Hebrew as Msgr. Knox evidently is should translate it only by way of the Latin version is hard to understand.

I must point out that whenever the Latin is difficult or obscure, or whenever it departs in any material way from the Hebrew, Msgr. Knox is prompt to cite in a footnote what the difficulties or differences are, and in these notes he is often careful to give his readers just what the Hebrew says or means. Indeed, at some points, he puts his translation of the Hebrew into the text and discusses St. Jerome's peculiarities in the footnote. Any Protestant or Jew would have preferred that he make this latter process his regular procedure. But he is translating the Catholic Bible for Catholics. This must always be borne in mind.

An instance of translating the Hebrew instead of the Latin may be cited: at Lamentations 4:3 St. Jerome says, "But witches have bared their breasts and nursed their own whelps." Msgr. Knox calls this "obscure and inappropriate" and renders the Hebrew, a bit freely, but with the accepted meaning of the word in question, "Cub of jackal is fed at its own dam's breast."

As for the notes explaining the differences between the Latin he translates and the original Hebrew from which St. Jerome for some reason or other has departed, many involve difficulties in the Hebrew which neither St. Jerome nor more modern translators have been able to resolve. Thus, at Lamentations 4:7 the most recent Hebrew lexicon simply says the word in question is unexplained; the Jewish version has guessed "polishing"; Msgr. Knox thinks, in his footnote, that perhaps it means "coral." The Latin text here reads "ancient ivory" which Knox renders as "tinted ivory." Not much more can be said. A simpler instance is the first that occurs in Genesis: at 1:20. The footnote indicates that whereas the Hebrew means "let winged things fly," the Greek and Latin versions represent the birds, like the fishes, as having been produced from the sea: hence the translation offered: "Let the waters produce moving things that have life in them and winged things that fly above the earth . . . "—a very remarkable anticipation, it might be said, of nineteenth century comparative anatomy. The Jewish Version, more literal than scientific in this instance, reads, "Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures and let fowl fly above the earth. . . ." Here, for once, Msgr, Knox has preserved Hebrew parallelism, which may be the original writer's method of inferring a similar origin for both species of fish and of birds.

The point should be made, it seems to me, that however his Catholic faith has determined for Msgr. Knox the text which he feels bound to translate in the main—i.e., the Vulgate of St. Jerome, his sound scholarship is everywhere reflected in careful and conscientious citation of difficulties in this version and also in the underlying Hebrew, whether the latter be reflected in the Latin or not. He knows the Latin is a translation and insufficient, of it-

self, to determine the real meaning of the text it purports to represent. He spares no pains to investigate that text and the adequacies or inadequacies of St. Jerome's authoritative version of it. He translates the Latin, as he feels he must, as a Catholic. But he is critical of it, too. So he also enters in footnotes his translation of the Hebrew at difficult points or his understanding of the disagreements between them. No other modern translator of the Old Testament into English has been as honest and fair with his readers as has Msgr. Knox. The revisers of the Authorized Version, in the past century, gave marginal variant readings to meet this situation; but Msgr. Knox's notes are much more full and satisfactory, even though they are limited to matters of Hebrew and Latin and occasionally Greek texts. With a limited apparatus he has done an excellent job of text criticism and interpretation.

This brings us to the final area of discussion proposed for this review. What of the English style and literary character of Msgr. Knox's Old Testament translation?

One main point here has already been touched upon: his refusal to transfer the poetical forms, especially the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, into English speech. To balance this defect, however, it may be pointed out that the effort to make Hebrew poets speak idiomatic English, even though it be English prose rather than verse, has brilliantly succeeded.

Consider the Bible's most lyric passage, in Song of Songs 2:11 f.: in the AV it reads, "For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land; the fig tree putteth forth her green figs, and the vines with the tender grape give a good smell." There is rhythm here. The Authorized Version is very graceful. But turtle for a species of dove is unfortunate and "give a good smell" is infelicitous. Usually the quotation ends with the voice of the turtle. But then it ends with a curiosity, to say the least. Hear Msgr. Knox's version: "Winter is over now, the rain has passed by. At home, the flowers have begun to blossom; pruning-time has come; we can hear the turtle-dove cooing already, there at home. There is green fruit on the fig trees; the vines in flower are all

fragrance." The rhythm is lost—Msgr. Knox means us to read the poet's idea in prose, not in verse. But this is delicate prose, with its short sentences and its prose-refrain of "at home" as a free translation of "in our land": "At home, the flowers have begun to blossom, pruning-time has come; we can hear the turtle-dove cooing already, there at home." There is an emotional chord struck and struck again with that "at home"—as in Robert Browning's "Home Thoughts from Abroad"—"Oh, to be in England, now that April's there, and whoever wakes in England. . . ." "This is great art . . . no less than skillful translation, even if James Moffatt has anticipated Msgr. Knox in recognizing that the Hebrew word usually rendered *singing* (Authorized Version: "the time of the singing of birds") is the only biblical occurrence of the expression in the ancient Hebrew calendar discovered at Gezer for *pruning*. As a matter of fact, Moffatt got it from the Hebrew lexicons of modern date. But Knox is translating St. Jerome's Latin, not the Hebrew. And that ancient scholar already knew, from his Jewish teachers, that *zamir* means pruning in this instance, and not singing.

Or consider the prophets' most brilliant passages — like Nahum 2:4, or Isaiah 2:10-19. Read each in the Authorized Version and then in Msgr. Knox's version:

"The chariots shall rage in the streets, they shall jostle one against another in the broad ways: they shall seem like torches, they shall run like lightenings."

"How jostle they in the streets, those chariots, hurtle they in the open market-place; dazzle they like flame of torches, like the lightening that comes and goes!"

And Isaiah in the Authorized Version:

"Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty. The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down; and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. For the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty, and upon every one that is lifted up; and he shall be brought low: and upon all the cedars of Lebanon, that are high and lifted up, and

upon all the oaks of Bashan, and upon all the high mountains, and upon all the hills that are lifted up, and upon every high tower, and upon every fenced wall, and upon all the ships of Tarshish, and upon all pleasant pictures. And the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be made low; and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. And the idols he shall utterly abolish. And they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth."

And now, Msgr. Knox:

"See where the Lord comes, in all his terrors, in all the glory of his majesty; take refuge, now, in some rock-cavern, hide thee in some pit! Now indeed man's haughty looks must fall to earth, human pride must be abated; no room for any greatness but the Lord's, when that day comes. With the dawn of it, all human pomp and state must be overshadowed, all human magnificence grow dim. High it will rise above the cedars of Lebanon, that grow so straight and tall, above the oaks of Basan; above aspiring mountain and swelling hill; above every topless tower, every impregnable citadel, above all the navies of Tharsis, above every sight that is fair to see. Shall not man's greatness fall to earth, shall not human pride be abated then? Vanished the false gods, only cave in the rock, crevice in the ground will afford shelter, when the Lord comes, great and terrible, rises up to smite earth with dread!"

It does not appear in this noble prose, perhaps, but almost everywhere in Msgr. Knox's pages, the idiom and vocabulary of British English shows up. This is as it should be, but is worth pointing out to American readers. Consider, for example, the two pages on which the latter half of Jeremiah, chapter 11 and chapter 12, appears. At 11:9 we read of a "cade lamb." It is the first time I can recall seeing and looking up this English dialect term. It means what we should call a "pet lamb" from the same root as words like *cosset* and *coddle*. It accurately translated St. Jerome's *agnus mansuetus,* which in turn more accurately represents the Hebrew word *alluph,* from the verb *alaph* mgn. to be familiar, be linked with, than does the Jewish Version's "docile." But what American would speak of a cade lamb, meaning a pet lamb?

At 12:15 Knox uses "the fens of Jordan" for the literal "pride of Jordan" which the Jordan's most renowned authority,

President Nelson Glueck, formerly director of the American School at Jerusalem, translated "the jungle of Jordan." Now in Boston there is a "fenway"—a park that has been developed along a road through fens, i.e., marshes. And Glueck speaks of the Jordan's thickets of jungle growth as being on a flood plain. So the term is again quite exact. But "jungle" or "thickets" would be more usual in American speech.

At v. 10 Knox employs *drovers* instead of the literal and more usual shepherds. I saw the term in an article in the *National Geographic,* speaking of Irish cattlemen. Of course we in America know nothing but cowboys in this connection! Properly, though, a drover is a dealer in cattle, who drives sheep, for example, to market. This may be the very meaning in this passage, which speaks of these men trampling vineyards and farm lands—i.e., on the way to market, rather than in normal sheep-herding. V. 12 goes on to mention *freebooters,* as a translation of St. Jerome's *vastatores,* destroyers, "plunderers" in the Hebrew. This seems better than JV's "spoilers." But it sounds undeniably British to me—we should probably resort to a colloquial word like "mobsters" or "gangsters" in America, which is exactly what "freebooters" once were.

Finally, at 12:16 "their fortune shall be founded" is a paraphrase for the JV's literal "they shall be built up"—which is exactly what St. Jerome says: "audificabuntur." I suppose fortunes are founded in America, too, or "founded anew" which is more fully the expression here. But the expression means to us one thing—money; Carnegie and Morgan founded fortunes, but not a society or community that rebuilds its whole way of life after some disastrous calamity. That is British idiom, when to be built up in all manner of ways means to have one's fortunes founded anew. It is also British and characteristic of Msgr. Knox's art of translation when the last verse of ch. 12 is rendered, not literally, as in JV "If they will not hearken, then will I pluck up that nation, plucking up and destroying it, saith the Lord,"—but in more literary manner: "But wherever my call goes unheeded, the Lord says, that people's uprooting shall be that people's undoing."

It would be the undoing of American civilization if our speech and literature were ever to become wholly uprooted from English soil. Say what you will of political or economic ties or rifts, between Great Britain and the United States, culturally we are heirs of a common tradition. We in the States, therefore, need to read English authors, to keep in touch with the sources of our own divergent tongue. We have long cherished the King James Bible as a primary source of English "pure and undefiled." Our American Standard Version was an abortive effort at revision of the Bible, soon now to be replaced by another. I would recommend Msgr. Knox as a distinguished writer of English, representing in his translation of the Old Testament a brilliant effort to accomplish an impossible, but necessary, task, viz., to turn the Hebrew Scriptures into an English that is accurate, intelligible and readable. He has very nearly succeeded.

Of Repentance*

Bertha Paulssen

THE TEXT of Article XII of the Augsburg Confession according to the Book of Concord reads in translation as follows:

Of Repentance they teach that for those who have fallen after Baptism there is remission of sins whenever they are converted; and that the Church ought to impart absolution to those thus returning to repentance. Now, repentance consists properly of these two parts: One is contrition, that is, terrors smiting the conscience through the knowledge of sin; the other is faith, which is born of the Gospel, or of absolution, and believes that, for Christ's sake, sins are forgiven, comforts the conscience, and delivers it from terror. Then good works are bound to follow which are the fruits of repentance.

They condemn the Anabaptists, who deny that those once justified can lose the Holy Ghost. Also those who contend that some may attain to such perfection in this life that they cannot sin.

The Novatians also are condemned, who would not absolve such as had fallen after Baptism, though they returned to repentance.

They also are rejected who do not teach that remission of sins comes through faith, but command us to merit grace through satisfactions of our own.

No effort will be made in this presentation to add to the recent theological analyses of Repentance. Aulén and Schlink have thoroughly presented the present-day interpretation of the concept from the Lutheran point of view.[1] However, it seems to me that the contemporary minister as a pastor, as well as the Protestant Christian, needs a deeper psychological understanding of repentance, as a crucial experience in the religious life of people today.

This undertaking makes it immediately necessary to expand the sources for the discussion beyond the text of Article XII.

*The 1951 Holman Lecture on The Augsburg Confession, at Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

1 Gustaf Aulén, *The Faith of the Christian Church* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1948), Part III, Div. B. Edmund Schlink, *Theologie der Lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften* (Muenchen: Kaiser Verlag, 1946), Kap. V.

The limitations of its wording and the stiffness of the expression can be partly explained by the fact that the Confessional Articles were polemic by nature. The fact that the text was given in Latin adds to its lack of emotional depth, while the early German versions have a less scholarly tone and retain some of the warm and personal way of speaking that is so characteristic of Luther.[2]

However, the Article comes to life and reveals much of the reality and depth of the experience of repentance, as Luther lived it, when one consults the corresponding parts of the Apology.[3] More insight still is gained when one reads Luther's own statements concerning his own fundamental experience of repentance.

The importance of Article XII as a cornerstone of the Lutheran faith is clearly expressed in the Apology where the problem of repentance and justification by faith is called "the chief topic of the Gospel, the remission of sins."[4]

The Augsburg Confession is a document of theological controversy and as such endangered by polemic and argumentative purposes, but it is fully balanced by the deep psychological insights into the nature of repentance which are found in abundance in the Apology.

Wilhelm Dilthey, the famous German psychologist and historian, in an essay on "The Understanding of Other Persons and Their Expression"[5] has described the influence which the study of the life and faith of Martin Luther had upon his religious life. He says, "For me as for most people today, the possibility of living through religious experiences in my own person is narrowly circumscribed. But when I run through Luther's letters and writings, the accounts given by his contemporaries, the records of the religious conferences and councils and of his official activitives, I live through a religious process of such eruptive power,

2 M. Reu, *The Augsburg Confession* (Chicago: Wartburg Publication House, Illinois, 1930), Part II, pp. 178 ff.

3 *Book of Concord* (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publication House, 1930, pp. 78 ff.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 79.

5 Wilhelm Dilthey, *Gesammelte Schriften,* VII, pp. 213-216.

of such energy, in which the stake is life or death, that lies beyond any possibility of personal experience for a man of our day." "Here theological controversies become questions of inner experience."[6]

There are two essential points in these statements that may open up for us a helpful approach to the Christian experience of repentance as we find it in Lutheranism:

1. The depth, intensity and contagious power of the personal experience of Martin Luther that has really determined our understanding of repentance in answer to the question, "How do I find a gracious God?"

2. The difficulties and blocks that modern man encounters in his search for salvation as expressed by Dilthey, or more recently and more pointedly by Hanns Lilje in his book *Luther,* where he states: "The capacity [of modern man] to understand this existential question is nearly extinct."[7]

LUTHERAN TEACHING ON REPENTANCE

We are today fortunate to have a real psychological insight into the personal experience of Martin Luther, which led finally to his conflict with the Roman Church about the problem of justification or forgiveness and repentance. On this psychological basis the clarification of the importance of these two points for the Christian teaching and the final formulation in the Augsburg Confession developed.

Nearly simultaneously two outstanding scholars have given us the inner story of the beginning of the Lutheran Reformation—Hanns Lilje in his book on Luther[8] and Roland Bainton in his book *Here I Stand.*[9] The Reformation does not start in a mighty demonstration but in the secret, hidden depth of the soul of a

6 H. A. Hodges, *Wilhelm Dilthey, An Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1944), pp. 23-24.

7 Hanns Lilje, *Luther* (Nuernberg: Laetare Verlag, 1948), p. 89.

8 *Ibid.,* pp. 86 ff.

9 Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand* (New York: Association Press, 1951), pp. 41 ff., pp. 60 ff.

single man, in the encounter of this man with God. The experience of Luther grows out of severe inner crises, *Anfechtungen.* Here is a man who is haunted by the search for forgiveness of sin and salvation. Bainton has described these conditions as follows: "It is all the doubt, turmoil, pain, tremor, panic, despair, desolation and desperation which invade the spirit of man."[10] This experience of *Anfechtung* leads Luther to experiment with all the means that the Sacrament of Penance of the Roman Catholic Church has to offer. But no answer, no way out of the anxiety and of the alienation from God, is found till in the quietness of the tower in the Black Monastery at Wittenberg (*Turmerlebnis*), probably in 1512 or 1513, he finds the key and "the doors opened—I entered into Paradise."[11]

The element of subjectivity in this religious experience is undeniable. Luther himself describes how he discovered *Zusammenhang*—a new meaning, as a gift of God, and how he suddenly saw the Scripture in an entirely new light. His own statements about this experience are the most compelling testimony as to how faith grows. It is not a psychological experience separated from the revelation of the Bible. Wrestling with the Scriptures, the history of the Jewish people, and the story of Christ; wrestling with the experiences of the witnesses of the Old and the New Testament, the two-fold meaning of repentance, Contrition and Faith, is found.

In Article XII of the Augsburg Confession we find a reflection of this discovery. Repentance is defined as consisting of two parts, contrition and faith. Contrition is the terror that smites the conscience of the sinner. The Apology describes the terrors, the anxiety, the fear, the mortification of the conscience "which feels the wrath of God against sin"[12]—"flees from the dreadful wrath of God."[13] "For the Law accuses and terrifies conscience." "Mortification signifies true terrors such as those of dying." "This con-

10 *Ibid.*, p. 42.
11 Hanns Lilje, *Luther* (Nuernberg: Laetare Verlag, 1948), p. 92.
12 *Book of Concord*, p. 80.
13 *Ibid.*, p. 80.

trition takes place in this manner when sins are censured by the word of God."[14]

The human soul that is confronted with the holiness of God, sees its own life, its own actions, its own will, as a reality, cannot be convinced that it can find salvation and peace out of its own strength. The catalogue in the Apology of all the fruitless means by which man has tried to find forgiveness is complete.[15] Neither attrition, nor contrition, neither detestation of crime, nor good works can give remission of sins. Neither can the power of the Church, "the power of the Keys," transform eternal punishment into temporal, nor acts of worship, nor reception of the Sacrament of Repentance, *ex opere operato*. No indulgences can blot out sin. No perfectionism in conduct may be achieved. Enumerations of offenses in confession do not reach the real problem. It is only by faith in Christ, believing in the Gospel, when it is heard, that forgiveness is granted.

This belief is not a general faith in the history of the Gospel but the revelation, the meaning of the history and the teaching of the Gospel about Christ. In the faith, that for Christ's sake we are forgiven, the anxieties and terrors of sin are overcome. Faith brings justification and regeneration, faith brings in the heart peace and joy and new life.

The fundamental insight which is needed to gain faith is the understanding of man's own nature, of his entanglement in sin, and his alienation from God. Through the apprehension of the real meaning of the life of Christ, in faith, this gift of God is received and fellowship is restored. The meaning of Paul's statement "The just shall live by faith," Romans 1 :17, became the starting point for Luther's road to salvation. The restoration of fellowship with God, not in the technical or legal sense of justification, but in the sense of forgiveness which "stems from the area of the most intimate personal life,"[16] vs. the sorry point in the experience of repentance.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 80.
15 *Ibid.*, p. 79.
16 Gustaf Aulén, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, pp. 290 ff.

The results of this new discovery for history are overwhelming. Wilhelm Dilthey has described how he re-lived Luther's experience and how he suddenly became aware of the following fact: "I see how that which thus takes shape in the monasteries spreads through innumerable channels, pulpits, confessionals, professorial chairs, writings—into the lay world; and then I observed how councils and religious movements have spread everywhere the doctrine of the Invisible Church and Universal Priesthood, and how it enters into relation with the liberation of personality in secular life; how in this way, what had been achieved in the solitude of the cell, in struggles of such violence as has been described, maintains itself in the face of the Church."[17]

However, Luther's experience does even more than that: it changes the whole frame of reference concerning salvation from a legalistic, forensic approach to an interpersonal, existential relationship between man and God. Justification becomes forgiveness. Repentance becomes the innermost relationship between man and God; merit, perfection, good work and the mediatorial role of saints and even of the Church are destroyed. The true meaning of the biblical concept of *Metanoia* has been regained: turn around, and your alienation and estrangement from God can be relieved.

MODERN MAN AND REPENTANCE

What has become of this message of the Reformation in the Protestant churches in western culture today? We find a strange and rather paradoxical situation. On the one side we know that modern man suffers to such a degree from anxiety, terror, dread, and fear that he is living virtually in hell. On the other side he refuses to face the real nature of his predicament and has invented a host of patterns of escape and evasion. As a result he has lost God and is about to destroy himself and the culture which he has created and of which he is so amazingly proud.

We are living in a period of history which is characterized by an unprecedented number of breakdowns of individuals and

17 H. A. Hodges, *Wilhelm Dilthey, An Introduction,* pp. 124 ff.

shocking outbreaks of large scale destructiveness, hostility, hatred and despair—the background of which psychologically is anxiety and dread of life. Modern man lives in hell outwardly and inwardly and expresses this fact in action and attitude, in word, dream and art and in all his interhuman relationships. His scientific, self-asserted, proud mind has created a man-made world. In this world he has subdued nature, has learned to unleash its forces for his service, has overcome time and space. Yet all his creations turn in the last analysis against him and become the most important source of an ever-increasing anxiety, fear, terror and dread. Man has lost the capacity for warm lasting interhuman relationships and true fellowship. And his personal relationships only increase the haunting negative emotions which threaten his personal security.

He never faces, understands, or recognizes his anxieties. He is unaware that they are the result of his estrangement from God. He never analyzes them as the necessary result of a life totally void of any meaning. Starved for salvation, yet religiously totally illiterate, he seeks and finds a way out in any possible kind of escape or substitute for salvation. He experiments with all efforts to redeem himself; every field of life, science, love, recreation, work, politics and even religion become a vehicle for this escape.

The barriers and blocks that separate him from God are firmly rooted in his pride, egocentricity and self-sufficiency and are fortified by a secular culture that has lost the capacity to see beyond the limitations of pseudo-scientific interpretation of life. We may gain the best psychological insight into modern man's predicament through two types of contemporary experience. The one is the most individualized and intimate knowledge of men in the findings of modern psychoanalysis. The most general and universal insight is gained in watching the outbreaks of totalitarian political revolutions.

Even if we do not believe that the scientific way of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy alone can free man from his anxiety and dread of life, this method has brought into the open the whole emotional pattern of modern man and has in an amazing way

substantiated the Christian view of man's very nature. This insight into the inner life of a man when he has a full mental breakdown, shows that he is filled with negative emotions—hostility, hatred, fear, anxiety. The problem of guilt and guilt feelings, brought out in psychoanalysis, still perplexes and disturbs the psychoanalyst. It is further surprising to find that there is a fierce opposition called "resistance," which the analyst encounters when he tries to help the sufferer to gain insight into his faulty pattern of life. Complex ego-defenses[18] and security operations[19] against the effort to accept help are known to be one of the most serious problems of psychoanalysis. Even when help is desperately needed the egocentricity of the sufferer prevails and "hugging one's neurosis"[20] is a frequent defense mechanism.

The creation of "insight" into one's own faulty life pattern, which is one of the major objectives of psychotherapy, has many similarities with the religious experience of repentance. It is often described as having two stages—the discovery of one's own psychological reality including anxieties, terrors and fears, and the second step of being helped on the road to "reorientation." There is in many sensitive and responsible psychoanalysts a cautious attitude towards too early an effort to make the patient see his own true self, for in the point of "reorientation" this new science of man faces its most difficult problem. Anxiety must be recognized, guilt faced and admitted; but forgiveness and redemption that free from guilt cannot be achieved by analysis alone. A new meaning of existence is not created by insight alone and here lies one of the present-day problems of psychoanalysis.

The other type of experience which shows modern man's desperation is found in the violent outbreaks of hatred in human group life. There seems to be a kind of perverted frenzy with which man throws himself into mental slavery of political dictators, who preach hatred and aggression. The increase of this tend-

18 Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, *Principles of Intense Psychotherapy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), p. 73.

19 *Ibid.*, pp. 107 ff.

20 Carl R. Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy* (New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1942, p. 400.

ency all over the world, the deterioration in human relationships, as we have experienced them in Germany under Hitler and in Russia under communism, show only too clearly the sickness unto death from which modern man is suffering. Christianity has frequently been the target of those outbreaks of hostility, and the Christian should be aware that frequently behind this hatred stands a desperate quest for salvation.

Christianity faces this pattern of modern mentality still divided in itself. Even the Protestant churches have often failed to keep alive the tradition of the Reformation. As Aulén has pointed out, nineteenth century Lutheranism has fallen back into some of the false, ineffective means for dealing with man's sin which the Apology enumerates so clearly.[21] The eternal temptation, even of Protestant Christians, will remain the seeking of merits in one way or another to find remission of sin.

For modern mass-men the Roman Catholic way still has a great appeal. Robert Bonthius in his recent book has called this the forensic pathway to salvation.[22] Aulén speaks about the legalistic interpretation of salvation.[23] This way starts with trust in the Church and its treasures of grace and its means of redemption, leads through the confessional to contrition and absolution, and provides tangible opportunities of restoration. Though the expression "salvation by organization" as Reinhold Niebuhr called it, may be too pointed, it describes quite well the Roman Catholic approach in contrast to the totally inward experience of faith.

Protestantism on the other side is eternally beset by two other deviations from its original road to salvation. One is the moralistic or perfectionist pattern, which Bonthius calls the "rejectionist pattern of salvation."[24] Man's remorse and penitence, or his perfectionistic moralism, are meant to give salvation. On the other side Protestantism is tempted to accept the easy conscience of a humanistic concept of the nature of man. Both patterns of

21 Gustaf Aulén, *The Faith of the Christian Church,* pp. 296 ff.

22 Robert H. Bonthius, *Christian Paths to Self-acceptance* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1948), pp. 39 ff., 55 ff.

23 Gustaf Aulén, *The Faith of the Christian Church,* p. 289 f.

24 *Ibid.,* pp. 1 ff.

salvation leave modern mass-man helpless when he faces sin, guilt, and the total emptiness of his existence.

There are, however, some redeeming factors in this disturbing picture of our time concerning the problem of salvation and the meaning of repentance. The catastrophic nature of our global life shakes mankind everywhere. The search for salvation all over the world, in the hearts of individual Christians and in small groups of men and women, has greater proportions today than we may be willing to recognize. Somehow we stand again where Luther stood before he found grace—in a time of struggle and search, where century-old cultural patterns break down and new forms of social, economic and political life are coming. In such a time theology is not any longer a merely scientific enterprise but becomes a basis for the "representation of Christianity to a world near the edge of being void of it."[25] We are living in a time of crisis which waits for another Reformation. The Renaissance of Luther and his road to faith may help us in our struggle. The call of repentance, so often heard after World War II, may lead us to a deeper understanding of our traditional doctrinal teaching if we can fill these words with living experiences of faith and grace.

25 John Line, "Decisive Theological Issues Today," *Theology Today*, April, 1951, pp. 20 ff.

Evangelical Witness in Latin America

William George Arbaugh

IN THE great Evangelical movement of world-wide missions the Lutheran Church has had a significant part, although not so large or distinctive a part as warranted by her strength and opportunities. On the other hand, Lutheranism's history during the twentieth century reveals tremendous losses in the very lands in which it was supposed to be most strongly entrenched. The rise and strength of secularism and of sectarian movements like Pentecostalism in the Scandinavian countries must be regarded as a most serious threat to Lutheran security in areas where our faith formerly had no competition and the people are even now statistically listed as being nearly 100 per cent Lutheran. In Germany, the homeland of Lutheranism, our Church is fighting to survive, and although the situation there includes powerful external enemies and the issues are most complex, it is obvious that internal weakness is a far more serious factor than it should have become. In the United States of America the Lutheran Church could well have sixteen million members instead of six million if it had not been for the losses to other Protestant bodies due largely to a lack of Lutheran missionary zeal and to the hesitation of congregations of German and Scandinavian immigrants to drop the languages of the fathers in favor of the language of the children. Both in Europe and in America the colossal sin of our Lutheran Church as a church has been that of complacency and indifference to its missionary duty. Thinking itself strong, it has not taken heed of the devil and his designs. The result has been an inexcusable tragedy.

In a recent article in The Lutheran Quarterly Pastor Harold Floreen calls attention to an element of weakness in the otherwise strongly Lutheran emphasis on the biblical doctrine of justi-

fication by faith alone.[1] He contends that in defending this doctrine Lutherans have tended to be so much concerned with combatting legalism that they have neglected the important aspect of the universality of salvation. When Paul affirms that the gospel of Christ "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek,"[2] his readers should feel constrained to carry that gospel to *every one,* without distinction of persons. There is a similar evangelistic implication in Paul's words to the Galatians: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."[3] Pastor Floreen points out that "Luther also acknowledged the practical implications of justification by faith. No ministry was more inclusive than his, for he sought to minister with the gospel, without distinction, to rich and poor, peasant and noble, ignorant and learned, Jew and Gentile. He sharply denounced any claim to superiority by priest or monk, teaching rather the 'priesthood of all believers.' "[4]

The missionary or gospel witness (and we use the terms here synonymously because the preaching of the "good news" is the essence of missions) is weakened whenever it is limited. It is weakened by geographical barriers until Christians cross the oceans and the mountains and the deserts to bring the blessings of the Gospel to needy souls. It is weakened by linguistic barriers when Christians cannot make effective use of the language of needy neighbors. Above all, it is weakened by the limitations resulting from pride and selfishness, when believers withhold their witness because their own love is less inclusive than the love of Christ and they do not wish to admit to places at their side in the communion of saints such persons as belong to a different race or have a different national origin or live in a lower social

1 Harold Floreen, "A Lutheran Singapore," The Lutheran Quarterly, III, 167-181 (May, 1951).

2 Romans 1:16.

3 Galatians 3:26-28.

4 Floreen, *op. cit.,* pp. 169-170.

or economic class. It is a terrible thing for a Christian to insist on his neighbor's right to justification by faith alone and then coldly ignore his neighbor's desperate need of the faith that justifies. It is an enormous sin deliberately to withhold the Gospel of Christ from others for whom He died but who are not likely ever to hear the good news except by our lips. The urgency and priority of missionary preaching is clear to Paul. To the Corinthians he writes: "Though I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!"[5]

In the home missions of the Lutheran synods of the United States of America it took about two hundred years to break down the barriers of national origins, and some Lutherans still express doubt that the Church of the Augsburg Confession can thoroughly assimilate persons with such names as Andrew MacTavish and Terence O'Toole. In the nineteenth century a German-American synod would not establish a new mission in a community where there were not enough German Lutheran immigrants to give it the needed strength. The presence of Swedish Lutherans was ignored as being irrelevant. A Swedish or Norwegian synod would proceed similarly, ignoring German Lutherans in organizing a new congregation. This nationalistic policy has disappeared primarily because of the change in language. The descendants of the Germans and the Swedes now speak English and gladly worship in the same congregations. At the present time still another wall is crumbling rapidly. The synods recognize that in planting new congregations through their boards of home missions it is not enough to inquire for people of Lutheran origin or descent. The church's mission is to *every one* who stands in need of the means of grace, regardless of former church affiliation. This is true when this needy neighbor lives in the shadow of our steeples, where the church is strong. It is also true when his home happens to be in a strange land, far from established congregations.

In harmony with these changes in the home missions outlook and policies there is a contemporary preference to regard missions

5 I Corinthians 9:16.

in Latin America as home missions rather than foreign. In thinking about foreign missions it is easy to regard the "non-Christian world" as steeped in the ideas and practices of pagan religions. In home missions we face a "non-Christian world" in which secularism, indifference, superstition, and dead ecclesiasticism so dominate the life of communities of Christian tradition that a powerful, organized Christian witness is called for. In Chicago and Caracas, as well as in Calcutta, there is need of evangelical witness. After specifically repudiating a racial or national basis for evangelization Paul goes on to exclaim: "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent?"[6]

The need of Christian missions in Latin America has been described with great earnestness and in great detail by many persons. Perhaps the most impressive call has been made by Father John J. Considine in his recent book, *Call for Forty Thousand,* published under the imprimatur of Cardinal Spellman in New York. This appeal for 40,000 additional priests for Latin America is the more significant in the light of the statement that there are only 23,480 priests now at work in Latin America.[7] Father Considine paints an appalling picture of ignorance, superstition, growing religious indifference, and Marxist materialism. For this situation he blames the numerical insufficiency and the poor qualifications of the priests. Typical of his book is his quotation of a remark by a gentleman of Lima: "Don't tell me of the beauty of Lima's monuments and art, of St. Rose, of the glorious past, or even of the city's highly creditable religious and cultural present. It only makes me feel a deep pain in my heart. I love Lima, but for me Peru means also the millions of souls in the mountains who live in the rags of a tattered culture and who are spiritually starving to death."[8]

Father Considine shows a surprisingly tolerant attitude toward Protestant missionary activity in South America and occa-

6 Romans 10:14, 15.

7 John J. Considine, *Call for Forty Thousand* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946), p. 14.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 106.

sionally expresses appreciation and even admiration for it. He sternly warns the Roman Catholics of Latin America and elsewhere against taking intolerant and uncharitable attitudes:

> After a prolonged discussion in Santiago with several Chilean friends, I wrote down their conclusions in the following little table of four "don'ts" and one "do" on the question of Protestantism in Chile. They might apply as well to other parts of Latin America.
>
> The table reads as follows:
>
> 1. DON'T question the sincerity of any considerable portion of those who become Protestants.
> 2. DON'T presume that any considerable portion of converts become Protestants to get North American financial support.
> 3. DON'T presume that any considerable number of Protestants hope to make progress by attacks and quarrelling; most of them know they must establish a strong religious life.
> 4. DON'T trust greatly to civil laws or other nonspiritual aids for the protection of Catholics.
>
> DO meet the peril to our Catholic life with greater Catholic life.[9]

The need of missions may or may not be greater in the United States of Venezuela than in the United States of America. That is not the most urgent question. We need rather to ask: Is there in Venezuela a pressing need of the Gospel that will not be met effectively unless we ourselves respond to that need? If the answer is in the affirmative the next question is: Are we North American Lutherans morally justified in adding 132 new mission churches in our home country each year and simultaneously deciding that the spiritual needs in Venezuela are of no concern to us? Must souls go hungry because of the geography, language, and religious history of their nation? Can we conscientiously excuse ourselves before God by pleading that only the Vatican has any moral responsibility for souls in the lands where the infamous Inquisition achieved complete success? If we must refuse to respond to need of the Gospel in any part of the world whatsoever, let us do it because of insufficient missionary personnel and insufficient funds, not for any lack of the constraining love of Christ.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 92.

Furthermore, let us not ignore some great nations altogether while lavishing our attention on favored communities of our homelands.

Many problems face us in the planting of new missions. In Latin America the problems are especially perplexing and numerous. The Roman Catholic Church is politically powerful in many countries and it does not observe the rules listed by Father Considine. In certain countries the missionaries labor at the peril of their lives. There are those among us who wonder if the expected results are worth the risk and the sacrifice. We would ask them just what results they expect. If we take the point of view of the defeatists, whose inspiration is small but whose inhibitions are many, we shall not attempt the difficult task. We wonder, however, what the course of Christian history would have been if Paul and Athanasius and Luther had been similarly frightened into silence and inactivity. We believe that great results can be expected of a great Lutheran mission in Latin America and that we should undertake it with boldness and determination. Our only doubts have to do with the over-all strategy and the varied programs for the various nations. In no two countries are conditions exactly alike. It is only reasonable that the mission program should be highly flexible and thus able to meet diverse and changing conditions.

In certain Lutheran churches of Puerto Rico and Argentina, where surnames are Spanish and that language has always been the medium of preaching and worship, there are members whose grandparents first heard the Christian evangel from the lips of Lutheran missionaries. Since the beginning of this present century the mission work has progressed to the point where sturdy congregations are ready to band together in appropriate ecclesiastical organizations. In Argentina the churches have organized the United Evangelical Lutheran Church with ecclesiastical autonomy but maintaining a certain affiliation with the United Lutheran Church in America. In Puerto Rico steps are being taken to join with the Lutheran congregations of the Virgin Islands in forming a Caribbean Synod within the general structure of the United

Lutheran Church in America. In both cases the congregations still receive financial aid in one form or another but they have made great strides forward in evangelism and in self-support, and the substantial character of the mission work that has been done is confirmed by the normal nature of synodical organization effected in one instance and currently being formed in the other. We can say with confidence that the church has been planted in these two Latin American fields and that, firmly rooted and sturdily growing, it is bearing fruit.

We are inclined to believe that when the Gospel comes in all its fullness to the masses in Latin America, this must take place through a reformation within the present Roman Catholic organization. Protestant missions can never be more than a partial response to the deep spiritual needs of one hundred million people. We suggested this in an article written for the Lutheran Home Missions Conference at Toledo, Ohio, in September, 1947.[10] Nevertheless, it is through strategic and energetic missionary programs in spiritually starved areas in Latin America that we are best able to prepare the ground for the anticipated reformation within the Roman Church. And in the event that such a reformation never comes, our missions will not only carry the blessings of salvation in a direct way to many persons, but will also, together with the missionary enterprise of other Protestant communions, force the Church of Rome to improve its work in many ways and thus become less scandalous and less obstructive to the work of the Holy Spirit. We can personally testify that in Puerto Rico that Church has been obliged by evangelical missions to change its methods and program so radically that many former causes of offense have been removed and others have been amended. Before Protestant missionaries came to the island, for example, the Roman Church utterly neglected the rural areas. Today the mountains and the plains are dotted with churches and chapels erected to meet the challenge of the Protestants who from the very begin-

10 William G. Arbaugh, "The Open Door Among Latin Americans," *The Open Door in American Missions* (Chicago, Division of American Missions of the National Lutheran Council, 1947), pp. 54-60.

ning of their work provided a special ministry to the underprivileged plantation workers and their families who constituted 80 per cent of the total population of Puerto Rico.

We hold the belief that in spite of the confused and erroneous thinking that results from the teaching of purgatory, indulgences, the worship of the saints and their images, and like matters, many men and women come to a saving faith in Christ through the ministry of the Roman Catholic Church. We rejoice therefore when we see that Church prompted to cleanse its sanctuaries and to gird itself for a more aggressive and more spiritual work. We are persuaded that Christians who contribute to Protestant missions in Latin America have the unique opportunity of seeing a remarkable multiplication of their talents. For every evangelical life consecrated to this cause there are two or three Roman Catholic lives so dedicated as a consequence, and for every North American dollar used in missions in this area Rome feels impelled to spend several dollars in a similar manner. Let us thank God when we see our talents thus multiplied.

The paramount requirement for a wise Lutheran missionary enterprise in Latin America is an all-embracing general strategy and a coordinated program. In 1947 we pointed out that "the present missionary endeavor of United States Lutheranism among Latin Americans stands in need of closer coordination in the survey and occupancy of new fields, in the planning and production of linguistic literature, and, to a limited extent, in the interchange and joint use of trained personnel. All this could be accomplished with or without coordination of mission administration. All that is needed is that due authority be given the several boards to take the necessary steps."[11]

The entry of the National Lutheran Council into the great Latin American field brings hope of more rapid progress in coordination than had seemed likely. Other encouraging steps have been taken. Worthy of mention here is the new Office of Spanish Publications of the United Lutheran Church in America, sponsored by a committee representing the boards of publication, home

11 *Ibid.*, p. 57.

missions, and foreign missions. The editor is striving to provide more adequate printed matter for all the Latin American missions of the United Lutheran Church and he hopes to integrate the production of his office with that of other Lutheran bodies, especially those that are members of the National Lutheran Council.

As we look out and survey the Latin American scene we are profoundly impressed with its marvelous potentialities as a field for a strengthened Christian witness and we are thoroughly convinced that the Lutheran Church is uniquely qualified for undertaking the kind of missionary enterprise that can most effectively convert those potentialities into glorious realities. We are also impressed by the time factor. The day is far spent. There is need to act quickly if the golden opportunities of the present moment are not to be irretrievably lost.

Fifty Years of Biblical Archaeology (Part II)

C. Umhau Wolf

ARCHAEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM

Archaeology has contributed to the reliability of the biblical traditions from Abraham to the Chronicler. It was inevitable that the results surveyed in the preceding section of this study should have had their impact on biblical criticism. If records, customs, laws, and so on are correlated, the plausibility of accuracy and consequent authenticity of the oral and written record in its transmission is increased. A whole school of criticism is developing, largely in Scandinavia, based on a renewed respect for the genuineness of oral tradition.[145] "In many ways, the orally transmitted record is superior, but it is peculiarly exposed to the phenomena of refraction and selection of elements suited for epic narrative, regardless of their chronological order."[146]

Archaeology, therefore is forcing a re-evaluation of some of the basic assumptions of the Graf-Wellhausian position.[147] In this section of the paper it is only possible to hint at the changes taking place, partly because of the scope of the changes, but more peculiarly because of the inconclusive state of the studies. Only a few old-timers and die-hards can speak any longer of "assured results" in biblical criticism, especially as applied to the Old Testament.

145 H. S. Nyberg, *Studien zum Hoseabuch* (Stockholm, 1935). Engnell, I., *Gamla Testamentet* (Stockholm, 1945), following partly Gunkel, H., *Genesis* (Tubingen, 1917), and the "Formgeschichte" school in New Testament, Bultmann, R., *Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelium* (Geissen, 1925). M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums,* 1933, 2nd ed.

146 W. F. Albright in *BP,* p. 6. Cf. summary *Expository Times,* 1948, p. 91.

147 Bentzen, A., *Introduction to the Old Testament,* 2 vols., Copenhagen, Coppens, J., *The Old Testament and the Critics,* 1942, and G. E. Wright, "Recent European Criticism of the Pentateuch," *Journal of Bible and Religion,* fall, 1950.

The commonly accepted theory of the evolution of religions, based on Darwinian-Hegelianism, has been a framework on which the literary development of the Old and New Testaments has been frequently pressed. The assumed stages of animism, polydaemonism, polytheism, henotheism, monotheism, and various refinements in between, were used to determine a relative chronology in various passages in the Bible and for various books or authors therein. Today there is no longer such blind faith in "inevitable progress."

At the dawn of history, archaeology confirms the establishment of the "great high gods" in both Sumer and Egypt. If there was any development in the line of the biblical tradition it antedates the beginnings of written records in 3600 B. C. Any "upward movement" took place in the pre-historic Near East. Animism was long since gone from the scene by the time that Abraham became a wandering Aramaean. Good as the older studies[148] may be on primitive religion, they are not dealing with the religion of Abraham or of the period of the conquest, but of "primitive survivals."[149] The concept of the "Great High God," together with tendencies toward monotheism therein, and the theoretical monotheism of Ikhanaton in the Amarna period, indicate that monotheism is not a late Greek invention.[150] Instead of an evolution, some of the Scandinavian school are suggesting a de-evolution and theorize that the "great high gods" break down into polytheism through a process of hypostasis.[151]

Contingent with this unacceptable assumption, is the evolution of the cult as a late refinement or, depending on one's position, a deterioration of religious feelings. Priesthood is then often considered later than the prophet, the so-called originator. Yet from the earliest historical records of Sumer and Accad there is a well established priesthood, just as the Egyptian Pharoah had his organization of priestly servants. Even in Canaan there is no longer

148 Cf. Smith, R., *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (London, 1894).

149 G. E. Wright in note 147 and also in *The Old Testament Against Its Environment* (Chicago and London, 1950).

150 The thesis of W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity.*

151 Cf. Ringren, H., *Word and Wisdom* (Lund, 1947).

any suggestion that the cult was primitive and undeveloped at the time of the Conquest. "It is not, however, true, that their religion was primitive in the sense of lacking organized priesthood, temple service and pantheon. Quite the contrary!"[152] In such an archaeological context we have had recently a restudy of the relation of the prophet and priest and their relation to cult.[153]

The evolutionary theory behind these first two assumptions has never precisely and unanimously decided whether the written record followed the historical progression, e.g., prophecy, law, poetry; or poetry, prophecy, law, or some other progression.[154] However, archaeology suggests that any such progression is an over-simplification of cultural elaboration. Thus we know of extra-biblical prophecy at least as early as the time of Saul.[155] Amos is then not necessarily the great innovator, but Nathan, Gad, Elijah and others take a significant place in the record even if they did not write books or have their oracles devotedly recorded.

Codes of law are not necessarily late in the written records of people. Even Hammurabi's code, of which so much was made a half century ago, is only a late version of many earlier codes.[156] The assumption that the more "humane" laws had to be late has also been disproven with the discovery that the Hurrian and Hittite laws were more "humane," especially toward captives and slaves, than the later Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian.[157] Thus there has been a gradual return to the recognition of early laws in the Pentateuch, some of which is Mosaic and other portions of which may be pre-Mosaic. Probably the civil laws reflect the adaptation of Canaanite laws to the period of the monarchy, while the religious and cultic

152 W. F. Albright in *BP*, p. 15.

153 A. Haldar, *Associations of Cult Prophets Among Ancient Semites* (Uppsala, 1945), and Engnell, I., *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (Uppsala, 1943).

154 Cf. Coppens, *op. cit.*, chapters IV and V.

155 For Wen Amun cf. Pritchard, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-29.

156 *Ibid.*, p. 159 ff. Cp. G. R. Driver and J. C. Miles, *The Assyrian Law* (Oxford, 1935). Also *BA*, XI, 2, p. 41 f.

157 W. F. Albright in *JPP*, I, p. 30; cp. Mendelsohn, I., *Slavery in the Ancient Near East* (New Haven, 1950).

laws are Mosaic or earlier, especially the section in the Book of the Covenant.[158]

Likewise with poetry, the tendency today is to date it earlier and earlier on the analogy of Semitic poetry in the second millenium B. C. The position of the liberal, derived from the study of a half-century ago,[159] is that there are very few pre-exilic Psalms. "The Hymn Book of the Second Temple" is taken to be a title signifying date of origin. The reaction is such that some recognize only one definitely exilic,[160] and the more cautious Bentzen recognizes many pre-exilic Psalms.[161] Many of the Psalms may be as early as David and Moses, if not earlier.[162]

Although we have already anticipated in part, another basic assumption of criticism fifty years ago was the relative lateness of writing in the Syro-Palestine region. It was once assumed that Palestine was almost an illiterate bridge between the highly civilized Mesopotamian and Nile Valleys. This is no longer plausible, with the Nuzu and Mari cuneiform texts, the Ras Shamra alphabetic texts, and the increased finds and restudy of proto-Sinaitic writing.[163] The apodictic laws, the cultic Psalms, the victory songs of Moses and Deborah, and the blessings of Jacob and Baalam are more and more recognized on the ground of philology to be pre-monarchial. "The discovery of the Ugaritic tablets revolutionizes our historical perspective of Hebrew literature, since we can no longer reduce dates just because evidence for earlier literary activity is wanting. In particular this discovery compels us to reconsider earlier arguments for dating."[164] Thus, although archaeology does not prove that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, it becomes more

158 Especially in the Book of the Covenant. W. F. Albright in *BP*, p. 11. Alt, A., "Ursprunge des Israelitischen Rechts," 1934, and other works by Alt and Martin North after him.

159 Buttenweiser, M., *The Psalms* (Chicago, 1938), Pfeiffer, R., *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Harper, 1942).

160 Engnell, I., *op. cit.*

161 Bentzen, A., *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 166 f., Vol. II, p. 168 f.

162 W. F. Albright, *BP*, p. 24; *JPP*, I, pp. 39, 46.

163 McCown, *op. cit.*, chap. 8, *BA*, VIII, 4, p. 93 f., XIII, 4, p. 74 f.

164 W. F. Albright, *JPP*, I, p. 39 f. *AP*, chap. VIII, G. R. Driver, *Semitic Writing* (Oxford, 1948), D. Diringer, *The Alphabet* (New York, 1948).

and more plausible that he could write, and even that he may have used written sources. The alphabet was known well before his day, contrary to the opinion of fifty years ago. And in Canaan in the age of Moses' grandfather, four different Canaanite scripts were used as well as Accadian cuneiform.

The later books of the Old Testament have also been illumined by the archaeology of the Old Testament. Greeks were known in Palestine in the seventh century and the Persians before that. So-called late allusions to such ethnic groups therefore are not necessarily indicative of late date. Archaeology likewise suggests that Aramaic was an important diplomatic language in the Assyrian period and so supports the Sennecharib-Hezekiah conversations in the Old Testament, but more than that, it became an almost universal language in the Persian period.[165] As mentioned in the introductory section, the discovery of Greek papyri has appreciably helped the study of the Greek New Testament. Likewise, archaeology knows of no "pious frauds" until the Greek period. On the contrary, the Semitic world revered and still venerates the oral and written word.[166]

The silence of the Bible has often misled critics into hasty judgments of unreliability. The criticism against the book of Daniel as unreliable history, and therefore a late fictionalized account of the time of Belshazzar, is not just. Belshazzar was probably the regent during the time that his father Nabonidus was on a campaign. This does not prove an early date for Daniel but together with the Aramaic argument this eliminates two props for the late date. Jeremiah and the Lachish letters see the historical situation eye to eye. The locale of Ezekiel's prophecy is suggested through archaeological interpretation of one of his acts.[167]

Other individual historical confirmations, illustrations, and supplementations of the reliable biblical record, hinted at in the first section, could be further developed here if space permitted.

165 O'Callaghan, *op. cit., passim.* C. G. Howie, *Date and Composition of Ezekiel,* *JBL* Monograph No. 4 (Philadelphia, 1950), chap. III.

166 Wright, in *JBR* and in *Old Testament Against Its Environment.*

167 Howie, C. G., *op. cit.*

This increase in historical respectability makes the subjective method of dating biblical writings unacceptable. To say, "It seems to fit," or "it doesn't fit" a particular period, may largely be the conclusion based on our ignorance of the period or similar periods and the conditions pertaining. The more clearly the framework of Israel's history in the Near East is brought into focus, and the more broadly the religious, linguistic, and philological background is understood, the less is the need for this subjective criticism. Nothing could be farther from the truth, fifty years later, than Driver's assumption, "Nothing has hitherto been established by archaeology that is inconsistent with those dates commonly assigned to them (i.e., the documents of the Pentateuch) by critics."[168]

The various texts and manuscripts mentioned at the end of the previous section are also important in criticism. The Dead Sea Scrolls have heightened interest in the reliability of the Masoretic Hebrew text. The Nash Papyri and the Chester Beatty Papyri make it almost possible to get back to a primitive text.[169] These texts and manuscripts, plus the new vocabulary helps from cognate languages, make subjective textual criticism less necessary than before.[170]

ARCHAEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION

Archaeology has enhanced our appreciation and understanding of the allusions of the Bible. It has clarified the meaning of many words, especially the hapaxlegomena. It has made consonantal emendation in Hebrew less imperative. It has emphasized the uniqueness of the biblical message against its pagan background. It is most unfortunate that few English commentaries on the Old or New Testaments have adequately made use of these new helps.

It is impossible here to compile the many contributions archae-

168 Driver, S. R., in Hogarth, *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 146.

169 Cp. the present plans for a new Critical New Testament text by an international committee. Cp. the summation of the Old Testament state in B. J. Roberts, *Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff, 1951). Cp. W. F. Albright, *BASOR*, 110, p. 3 ff.

170 Even Kittel's 3rd Edition *Biblia Hebraica* contains less emendations than in 1st edition.

ology has made to Hebrew and Greek lexicography.[171] Archaeology has permitted the recognition of Sumerian loan words in Hebrew.[172] The wide vocabulary of Ugaritic[173] has contributed perhaps more to the study of Hebrew than anything since the first decipherment of Assyrian a century ago. A few of these contributions have been noted by various scholars.[174]

With so much archaeologically determined usage available, new word studies can be made with reasonable accuracy. Tying in with the resurgence of theological interest in the Bible, such study has been especially popular among the Scandinavians and the English.[175] Among the words most recently restudied, against the background of Semitic and Greek writings are the following: *'eved,*[176] *torah,*[177] *dabir* and *chochma,*[178] *ruach* and *parakletoi,*[179] *sabbaoth,*[180] *messiach,*[181] *nabi',*[182] *ecclesia,*[183] and many words related to these. Especially noteworthy are the studies of psychological and political

171 Koehler, L., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leyden, 1948 ff.), does not fulfil this need. Even Kittel's *Wörterbuch* could be improved in certain sections. The new Svenskt Bibliskt Uppsalagsverk (ed. I. Engnell) in Vol. I, 1948, shows great consciousness of archaeology's contribution.

172 W. F. Albright in *JPP,* I, p. 30.

173 Gordon, C., *Ugaritic Handbook* (Rome, 1947), Glossary.

174 W. F. Albright, *AP,* p. 233 f. DeLanghe, P., *Les Textes de Ras-Shamra Ugarit et leurs Rapports avec le milieu Biblique de l'ancient Testament* (Paris, 1945). Also numerous contributions by Bauer, Gaster, Albright, Gordon, Ginsberg, etc., in *BASOR, BA,* and other journals.

175 The school of Engnell. Also Snaith, N., *Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, 1946), and Richardson, A. (ed.), *Theological Word Book to the Bible* (London, 1950).

176 Mendelsohn, *op. cit.* Cp. *BA,* XI, 2, p. 24 f., *BASOR,* 85, p. 14, and 89, p. 25 f.; Lindhagen, C., *The Servant Motif in the Old Testament* (Uppsala, 1950); North, C. R., *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (London, 1948).

177 Östburn, G., *Tora in the Old Testament* (Lund, 1945); Engnell, I., *Israel and the Law* (Uppsala, 1946).

178 Ringren, *op. cit.*

179 Johansson, N., *Parakletoi* (Lund, 1940).

180 Fredriksson, F., *Yahweh als Krieger* (Lund, 1945).

181 Manson, W., *Jesus the Messiah* (Philadelphia, 1946); Bentzen, A., *Messius, Moses Redivivus, Menschensohn* (Zurich, 1948). Cf. also *Israel* by Danell, G. A. (Uppsala, 1946).

182 Haldar, *op. cit.*

183 Johnston, G., *The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament* (Cambridge, 1943). Cp. translation from Kittel, *TWZNT,* Schmidt, *The Church* (London, 1950). And on all the above, relevant sections in Kittel thus far published.

terms by Pedersen.[184] This type of vocabulary study has led to an increased respect for the unity of the testaments.[185]

Closely connected with this contribution to our interpretation of the Bible, is the new respect for forms of literature.[186] Again Ugaritic has perhaps been most influential in this study, giving an entirely new insight into the significance of Hebrew poetry.[187] This is especially important in respect to the unity of the Psalms, and it has aided in the reaction to a too-detailed analysis, the scissors-and-paste-method, of interpreting the texts of the Bible. Likewise, the form of wisdom literature is better understood through the study of Egyptian wisdom[188] and more recently of Sumerian wisdom.[189] The liturgical use of much of the Old Testament and New Testament has been reaffirmed through the work of archaeologically informed scholars.

The discoveries at Mari, Nuzu, Elephantine, and elsewhere have appreciably increased our knowledge of allusions to customs and laws within the Bible. Many words have been devoted to these studies in the past ten years.[190] The aptness of adultery as a term for apostasy in the prophets is clearly shown by the background of the fertility cult of Canaan. In all this increase of knowledge, the uniqueness of the biblical religion is reemphasized.[191] There is

184 Pedersen, J., *Israel Its Life and Culture* (Copenhagen, 1926 ff.).

185 Dodd, C. H., *The Bible and the Greeks* (London, 1928). The latest issue of *Interpretation,* April, 1951, is devoted entirely to this theme. Cp. Nygren, et al., *En Bok om Bibeln* (Stockholm, n.d.).

186 Gunkel, H., *What Remains of the Old Testament* (London, 1928), and the development of Formgeschichte in the New Testament; cp. note 145 above.

187 Gordon, C., *Ugaritic Handbook,* Grammar, chap. XIII. A. F. Albright, *AP,* p. 231 f. No attempt is made in the footnotes of this section to be exhaustive.

188 Oesterley, W., *Wisdom of Egypt and the Old Testament* (London, 1927); Pritchard, *op. cit.,* p. 405 ff. Cp. Peet, T. E., *A Comparative Study of the Literature of Egypt, Palestine and Mesopotamia* (Oxford, 1931).

189 Kramer, S. N., in *BASOR,* 88, p. 10, and 122, p. 28 ff.

190 Kramer, S. N., *Sumerian Mythology* (Philadelphia, 1944), Obermann, J., *Ugaritic Mythology* (New Haven, 1948), Gaster, T. H., *The Epic* (New York, 1950), Frankfort, Frankfort, Wilson, Jacobsen, and Irwin, *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man* (Chicago, 1946), V. Ferm (ed.), *Forgotten Religions* (New York, 1950). Frankfort, H., *Egyptian Religion* (Chicago, 1950).

191 Most recently in Wright, G. E., *The Old Testament Against Its Environment* (Chicago and London, 1950), and Filson, F. V., *The New Testament Against Its Environment* (Chicago and London, 1950).

little danger of a new comparative literature school finding nothing original in the Bible, but only borrowings.

CONCLUSION

The work of historians, topographers, geographers, as well as archaeologists has contributed mightily to our understanding and appreciation of the Bible.[192] Much, however, remains to be done. Some of these needs for the second half of the twentieth century may be briefly noted in conclusion.[193] There is a desperate need for a theological lexicon of the Old Testament which is competently based on the latest archaeological and philological findings. Archaeology itself needs to re-affirm its support of the great Palestine Museum which at the present time is dormant, while Jordan and Israel take all field finds to new national museums. There is a need for a comprehensive and comprehensible history of the biblical periods. This will require cooperation and collaboration. Similarly it is most imperative that orientalists, archaeologists, historians and others make their impact felt in the theological world.[194] In order to accomplish this, scholars must be encouraged by the church, without any fear that scholarship makes traitors to the faith. Scholars must continue their specialization and yet must recognize the need for inter-study and inter-department work. Collaboration in humility is demanded by the order of the day.[195] A high degree of synthesis is rare, but one or two principles may be discovered in the next half century.[196]

192 Albright, W. F., in *AP*, chapters X and XI, Burrows, M., *op. cit.*, chaps. V and VI.

193 Cp. articles in Willoughby, H. (ed.), *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow* (Chicago, 1946).

194 George Mendenhall of Hamma Divinity School gave an informal address April 11, 1951, at the Mid-West section of the Oriental Society at Northwestern University on this theme.

195 Albright, W. F., in *JPP*, I, p. 28.

196 For the first half century Dr. W. F. Albright is such a scholar. If this paper seems a bit overly dependent upon his judgments it is because of his importance in the field. His ability in synthesis is shown by the second chapter of *FSAC*. He stands today head and shoulders above other Old Testament scholars. I have recently read the galley proofs for two articles on thirty years of archaeology of Palestine and the Near East by

Fifty years of biblical archaeology have been very inadequately surveyed in these pages: fifty years of one outstanding archaeological discovery, linguistic decipherment, biblical interpretation after another. As these results are weighed in the balances of theological judgment and scientific method, they are not found wanting. Although the science of archaeology does not and can not prove the validity of Israel's faith, nor of Paul's interpretation of the Messiah, it can cooperate with theology for the strengthening of the faith.[197] Even science reaches that point where the "leap of faith" is required. No amount of archaeology can prove the significance of Abraham's blessing, or validate John 3:16, or motivate the acceptance of I Corinthians 15.

197 Cf. Burrows, *op. cit.*, Par. 5 and 6.

Dr. Albright. These cover his active years in the Near East and will appear in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed., H. H. Rowley, Oxford Press, due for late fall publication.

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

Nattvarden i evangeliskt gudstjänstliv. By Yngve Brilioth. Stockholm: S.K.D.B., 1951. 421 pages. Second edition. Kr. 28.

Just twenty-five years ago Brilioth, then a theological professor, produced the first edition of this work. Gabriel Hebert translated the major part of this edition into English under the title of *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic* (1930) which has found wide reading, across denominational barriers. Now Brilioth, archbishop of Upsala, brings out a second edition in Swedish. The changes are relatively few but take into account new literature and recent events in the liturgical field during the quarter century.

Use is made of the findings of Lietzmann, Oesterly, Dix, Kjöllerstrom. This leads to a reconsideration of the question of the relationship between the Last Supper and the Jewish Passover. Brilioth believes that there lay a double motive in the origin of the Eucharist: both a continuation of fellowship with the Lord at His table and a commemoration of his death with its eschatological promise (37). Kjöllerstrom has discovered new evidence of the course taken by the Swedish Reformation and Brilioth inclines to the view that the Swedish Mass was very gradually introduced, at first as a part of the Latin Mass and then an alternative to it.

Among the important recent events which have become landmarks in liturgical history is the failure of the Anglican revision to win Parliamentary approval (the first edition seemed to imply that it would be approved), and the adoption of the Scottish *Book of Common Order,* 1940. The Scottish liturgy is described as one of the "most interesting creations in newer Christian worship life" (271). The archbishop is much concerned over the low estate of communion in Sweden. In his treatment of the evangelical world there is little reference to America. American Lutheranism presents quite a different picture than the European and would deserve treatment in a future edition of this valuable book.

The years have proved Brilioth's work a lasting achievement. His analysis of the elements of the sacraments — eucharist (thanksgiving), fellowship (communion), remembrance, sacrifice, mystery—stands as the most comprehensive and balanced treatment available. It helps us to evaluate such splendid studies as that of Gregory Dix (*The Shape of the Liturgy*) with its overemphasis on one element or the other. In its fairness we find help in the ecumenical endeavor to see the contribution of each church, and a warning to Lutherans who have almost lost the eucharistic and communal elements in their stress on the sacrificial moment.

Since the translation of Hebert was both free and incomplete (especially in the section on the Swedish Mass), it would seem that a translation of this second edition would be a welcome contribution to English liturgical literature.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

An Introduction to New Testament Thought. By Frederick C. Grant. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 339 pages. $3.75.

The reviewer intentionally deferred his review of this significant publication because he wanted to try it out on a group of students for the ministry. Their reactions to it turned out to be as varied

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

and inconclusive as student reactions normally are.

Most of the students in the group considered the book decidedly worth while, particularly as a reference work. Some of them remarked that they should have been compelled to read it at the beginning of their course at the Seminary, mainly for purposes of orientation. A few of them reacted enthusiastically to the author's very interesting and helpful interpretation of the miracles of Jesus, to his profound insights into the story of the Temptation, and to his consistent efforts to relate New Testament thought to its Old Testament background.

The reviewer gratefully concurs in the favorable comments which his students passed upon the book. It is the work of a competent scholar who is also an earnest believer with pronounced ecumenical inclinations. One can but stand in awe of the wealth of learning and insight that went into the making of the book. It is not a New Testament Theology in the traditional sense. True to its title, it is an "introduction" to New Testament thought. Almost a hundred pages are devoted at the start to an "introduction" to the introduction. Although this portion of the book could have been abbreviated, it serves a useful purpose as an *entree*. Most readers will probably find the *piece de resistance* more to their liking and also far more nourishing. It takes the form of an illuminating exposition of a sequence of grand and vital themes, such as the Doctrine of God, the Miracles, the Doctrine of Man, the Doctrine of Christ, the Doctrine of Salvation, the Doctrine of the Church, and New Testament ethics. In his explication of these themes the author makes telling use of his broad and intimate knowledge of the literature of the ancient world, secular as well as religious. He also succeeds in marshalling his facts and insights into a more or less coherent exposition for which all students of the New Testament should be extremely grateful.

Professor Grant would be the first to admit that some of the positions he takes are vulnerable and that his supporting arguments occasionally hang by a thread. No doubt the popular modern superstition that the Jews of the first century considered God remote and inaccessible is completely erroneous, but does the liturgical literature of the Jews prove the point? Liturgical literature is by its very nature archaic. Is the familiar phrase in John 4:24, "God is spirit," merely an affirmation of "the *incorporeal* nature of God"? Would Paul agree that God stood in need of a theodicy? Would Luke agree that he was actuated primarily by a desire to prove that the new faith was politically harmless? The reviewer is of the opinion that the exposition of the story of the Temptation, good as it is, would be even better if the thought that Jesus was tempted to perform some of the recognized "signs" of the Messianic Age had been brought out more clearly and emphatically. The author's emphasis on the "family of God" theme in his interpretation of New Testament ethics as a whole is very gratifying but the specific interpretation of the ethics of Jesus as an "agrarian protest" seems to involve a degree of oversimplification. Most of the reviewer's "guinea pigs" gagged at the phrase.

Many of them also contended that the book as a whole fails to do justice to that which is *new* in the New Testament. They appreciated the author's efforts to interpret the New Testament in the light of the Old Testament but they were irritated by what they believed to be a gratuitous effort to "soft-pedal" the differences.

The reviewer suspects that his students have instinctively put their fingers on an element of weakness in the book. Undoubtedly the early Christians, Gentile as well as Jewish, appealed to the Old Testament as the Word of God. Undoubtedly they "found Christ" in the Old Testament and believed with all their hearts that he was the divinely ordained fulfillment of the Old Testament. The fact remains, however, that most of the Jews of the first century did not look at the

Old Testament through Christian eyes. At a very early period serious tensions arose between the church and the synagogue as well as between the church and the pagan world. These tensions simply must be taken into account in our study of the New Testament. For example, how can we hope to understand Paul's theology unless we study it in the light of the so-called Emancipation Controversy? Granted that the extreme views of the old Tuebingen School have long since been discredited, we cannot afford to shut our eyes to the tensions and controversies that marked the *Werdezeit* of Christianity. To try to interpret the New Testament without taking tensions and controversies into account is a little like trying to interpret the literature of the Age of the Reformation without taking the Reformation into account! As Christians we may indeed deplore past controversies but as Christian historians we cannot and should not ignore them.

Professor Grant seems to go out of his way at times in order to make amends for the anti-Semitism that debased and disgraced some New Testament scholarship in the past. He finds a good many traces of anti-Semitism in the New Testament and pleads for the deletion of some of the more offensive passages from our public use of the New Testament. At one place he goes so far as to declare that "the whole Gospel of John is a polemic against Judaism" (p. 94). This unguarded and unhappy statement was no doubt written into the book in a moment of deep feeling. Most of us are quite willing to concede that the Fourth Evangelist was deeply concerned about Jewish unbelief, as he was concerned about Docetism and the propaganda of the disciples of John the Baptist, but we are reluctant to interpret the Fourth Gospel exclusively in the light of any of these secondary concerns. It is superlatively a work of genius, transcendent genius. As such it rises far above the polemical level.

Many of the reviewer's "guinea pigs" complained because they found the reading of the book rather difficult. Some of them called attention to the numerous parentheses, expressed and unexpressed. Sooner or later modern authors and publishers will have to learn that they cannot make a technical work readable merely by yielding to the popular prejudice against footnotes. Professor Grant's book would be ever so much more readable if some of the invaluable but parenthetical material woven into the body of the text had been incorporated in footnotes *at the bottom of the page.*

The reviewer detected misprints on pages 161, 162, 167, and 280.

RUSSELL D. SNYDER

On Whom the Spirit Came. By Miles W. Smith. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 253 pages. $2.50.

This is an excellent study of the progress of the Gospel as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. As the title indicates, it is not only concerned with the geographical or statistical progress, nor yet even with a social-institutional progress. "Ye shall receive power *when the Holy Spirit is come upon you,* and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." The author finds in this not only the outline of The Acts, or the "program of the Apostolic Church," but also the actual statement of what happened. The greatest importance is attached to the effect of the Spirit upon those individual witnesses "upon whom the Spirit came."

The author observes at least two self-imposed limitations. In the first place, he sets out to write a book that will be within the reach of the "average reader." In this he has succeeded, but there is at the same time much "freshness" for the reader who has studied The Acts many times. It is a "freshness" rather than "fresh" or new material; the merit of the book is the way in which it presents the story of The Acts.

The second self-imposed limitation is

that little use is made of the epistles of Paul. If one is to consider the life of Paul, which after all is an important part of The Acts, from the material in Acts only, then certainly one imposes an unwarranted handicap. The opposite extreme would seem to be *Chapters in a Life of Paul,* by John Knox, who proposes to base his work on the epistles only. See review in *The Lutheran Quarterly,* Vol. II (Aug. 1950), p. 345. According to that author the accepted chronology of Paul's life must be greatly revised. The present reviewer sees better reason for a limitation to material from Acts, but with the qualification that the "Acts of Paul" will come to better treatment than the "Mind of Paul."

The book is a "conservative" work. And yet the author, as shown by footnotes and bibliography, has consulted many authors not of his own way of thinking. It is not blind conservatism for the sake of being conservative. Improvements in translation are appreciated, as will be seen in the many cases where the Revised Standard version is preferred to the American Standard or the King James. The omission of additions to the text not found in the best manuscripts is also approved. The author accepts an early date for Acts, probably as early as A. D. 61.

The two themes of study proposed by the author are "The Work of the Holy Spirit" and "The missionary work of the churches." The "power," the "vitality" was always of the Spirit. Men labored endued with the Holy Spirit. "There is a sense in which it may be truthfully said that the Holy Spirit came upon the apostles in answer to their prayers" (p. 19). Luke "limits himself to telling what the *effect* of the Spirit's coming was upon the apostles—he never once fails to distinguish between that which is no more than material substance and that which is in essence wholly spiritual" (p. 20).

In chapter IV, as elsewhere, the Lutheran reader will notice the fact that the author is of another Christian communion in his interpretation of baptism and the Lord's Supper. "Luke says nothing expressly of any observance of the Lord's Supper, and we must be on our guard lest we read back into this account something which was not meant to be there. These are communal meals, not observance of the Lord's Supper as such. The Lord's Supper did not possess then, and should not possess now, the sacramental character which it later acquired" (p. 29). The author's views of baptism are found in connection with the preaching in Samaria, to Cornelius, to Lydia, and to the jailor at Philippi.

One of the merits of the book is the presence of many meaty statements of observations for the preacher. A few examples must suffice: "Whereas Judaism, historically and sentimentally, has kept its gaze fixed on Palestine, Christianity, like its Lord, looks out upon the world. With one Jerusalem is the goal; with the other only the starting point" (p. 58). "Note the confidence which the church had in the good judgment of Peter and John. But note also that the church 'sent' them; that is to say, the church laid this task on them. Peter had no such authority over the other apostles and over the churches as has been claimed by the Roman Catholic theologians. The greatness which Peter possessed did not reside in any office to which he had been appointed, or in any special prerogatives which had been granted to him; it lay in his devotion to Christ and in his willingness to serve Christ in whatever way he could" (p. 59). Farther on, in speaking of Paul on his second journey, we find: "By shutting one door after another, the Spirit had kept Paul from going in the wrong direction. Paul had to learn that the Spirit sometimes restrains instead of urges on. . . . Unknown to Paul, the Holy Spirit all the while had been leading him toward the discovery of his greatest missionary opportunity" (p. 127).

The author's disposition of events around the Jerusalem Council cannot be accepted by this reviewer. Having worked some time in Antioch after the first jour-

ney, trouble arose with Judaizers. Then Paul and Barnabas made a journey to Jerusalem to settle the matter (the "private meeting" of Gal. 2); then they went back to Antioch hoping that all was settled, for the "pillars" had agreed with them. At this time men came from Jerusalem, supposedly from James, and Peter, who was there, and even Barnabas succumbed to their threats. At this juncture Paul wrote his great manifesto, Galatians, and also demanded that the whole matter be gone over again in public assembly in Jerusalem. This required two journeys to Jerusalem instead of one; it divides the "private meeting" from the "public session," and interjects a period of labor and trouble at Antioch, plus the writing of Galatians.

The chapters on the "Arrest and Imprisonment" and "The Great Storm and Shipwreck" are delightful reading. There is nothing new for the expert in the Pauline field. The merit of these chapters is the vividness of the story, with appropriate realistic touches. The Book of Acts, as indeed the whole New Testament, is a missionary book and a book about missions, and the whole subject of missions is a very real one.

The book closes with an appendix containing a chronology, and a good though short bibliography. A third appendix contains "Questions and projects"; it will be useful for review and "self-examination." The book has no index, neither of terms nor of Scripture references, but in view of the fact that it limits itself to the framework of Acts, this is not as great a drawback as the absence of an index usually becomes.

MELVIN A. HELLAND

Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. By Norval Geldenhuys. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951. 685 pages. $6.00.

A new and extensive "International Commentary" on the books of the New Testament is about to make its bow to the English-speaking world.

The new series has been launched with a *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* by Norval Geldenhuys, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa. He received his academic preparation at Cambridge, Princeton, and Pretoria. Several years ago he published a commentary on the Third Gospel in his native Afrikaans, but Prof. F. F. Bruce, of the University of Sheffield, assures us in a Special Foreword that the present commentary is by no means merely a translation of the earlier commentary. Mr. Geldenhuys writes as a scholar who is also a pastor. As a scholar he has apparently read and digested every significant work on the Third Gospel in English, German, Dutch, and French. As a pastor he has striven earnestly to keep his eyes open to the religious values of the text.

The method adopted in the present commentary is of special interest because the other volumes in the series will presumably follow the same pattern. About 40 pages are devoted to introductory matters. The text of the Third Gospel is then split up into paragraphs of exegetical units. Each unit is printed out in full in the English of the Revised Version of 1881. Several pages are then devoted to a running exposition of the unit on the basis of the Greek text. The exposition is supplemented by numerous critical notes dealing with historical, textual, and grammatical difficulties. Interspersed among the expositions are Special Notes on a variety of subjects, such as the Virgin Birth, the Baptism of John, the Son of Man, and the Resurrection of Jesus. The commentary closes with an elaborate Excursus on the Day and Date of the Crucifixion. We learn that "Jesus died on or about the 6th of April in A. D. 30" (p. 670)! There is also an Index of Subjects as well as an Index of Scripture References.

A critical analysis of the new commentary would overflow the boundaries of the Book Department. Moreover, it would merely serve the rather dubious purpose

of giving the reviewer a forum in which to ventilate his grievances and register his dissents. He will therefore rest content with the simple observation that this is a scholarly commentary with ultra-conservative leanings. The scholarship reflected in it may indeed be encyclopedic rather than original, but it is nevertheless scholarship. The author at least goes to the trouble of marshalling competent opinion on mooted points. Although he casts his vote with clockwise regularity in favor of traditional views, he has manifestly given serious thought to the problems. His Fundamentalism is an informed and intelligent Fundamentalism, strongly conditioned by Calvinistic orthodoxy. Readers of all shades of opinion should be broad enough to give him a hearing.

The new commentary is likely to enjoy a wide circulation among pastors and laymen who arbitrarily limit their reading to literature that is reputed to be "safe." Such readers should probably be warned that right-wing heresies may be quite as dangerous as left-wing heresies. Witness the troubles Jesus and Paul had with certain right-wing "heresies" in Israel.

RUSSELL D. SNYDER

The Unity of Israel. By Oswald T. Allis. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1950. 134 pages. $2.25.

In this book Allis staunchly and ably defends the unity of Isaiah.

Instead of attempting many separate assaults on the contrary position, he centers his attack chiefly on the fact that the critical approach is the outgrowth primarily of the contention that *prediction* on the part of Old Testament prophets is, in the very nature of the case, impossible. Wherever therefore a prophet ventures to predict the more immediate or the more remote future, such passages are to be classed as later productions written in the light of events that have transpired, and are merely ascribed to the venerable prophet by a kind of literary device. Allis refutes this position effectively and makes out a good case for the unity of the book in the face of an opposition which in our day has become well-nigh general, at least in critical circles.

Two major issues are examined in detail—the Cyrus prophecies and the Suffering Servant passages. It is clearly shown that in both these areas prediction is involved. But, besides, many a point is presented to help the student appreciate the full import of the passages involved. So the book becomes more than a controversial work. It furthers one's appreciation of the deeper values of the prophet's message.

A most commendable book.

H. C. LEUPOLD

Exposition of Daniel. By H. C. Leupold. Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1949. 549 pages. $5.00.

The book of Daniel was written in a time of despair and dismay in order to emphasize the supremacy of God and his ability to carry out his purposes despite the machinations of hostile nations and men. There is a world-wide sweep and comprehensiveness of outlook about the book that distinguishes it from the rest of the Old Testament. It has been a source of inspiration and strength to all those who have realized its significance.

With this conviction the present commentary has been prepared. A threefold purpose, as stated in the book jacket, has been held in view: to show what a hopeful outlook the church of our Lord really has, to show by contrast how futile are all the achievements of empires and kingdoms, and to fulfill the need for a sober interpretation of difficulties which frequently beset the average reader of the sections dealing with visions. Dr. Leupold has succeeded well in fulfilling these purposes. One immediately senses that this commentary has been a labor of love into which the author has put hard work and sincere devotion.

He reveals the same carefully con-

sidered, conservative approach to all the problems of interpretation which he demonstrated in his previous commentary on Genesis. The format of this volume is similar: an introductory section followed by a verse by verse exposition of the text with brief homiletical suggestions included at the close of each chapter. Hebrew and Aramaic expressions have been transliterated. Brief grammatical comments are given in connection with significant words in each verse. The primary emphasis, however, is placed on the historical and theological significance of the verse.

Dr. Leupold challenges with polemical fervor the prevailing modern critical view that the book of Daniel is an example of apocalyptic literature in the Bible, a product of the Maccabean age, written to comfort the Jews who at that time were suffering persecution by the Seleucid ruler Antiochus Epiphanes. That the apocalyptic writings of late Judaism resemble David cannot be denied. The anonymous writers of these apocalypses put their messages to their contemporaries into the mouths of great figures of the past such as Enoch, Noah, Moses, and base what they have to say about the present and future upon a view of world history as divinely guided and controlled. Accordingly they often give more or less extended surveys of the past under the form of predictions uttered by great men of the past. They therefore present a philosophy of history rather than make actual predictions. Modern scholarship has taken for granted that Daniel like the apocalyptic writings presents history under the guise of vision.

Professor Leupold upholds with inflexible ardor the traditional view that Daniel himself is the author of the book that bears his name. He suggests that the book was written after the Persian conquest (538 B. C.). This explains to him the reason for the large number of Persian terms in the book. Daniel, he insists, took pains to bring his book up to date, even to the extent of substituting Persian terms to designate Babylonian officials in the pre-Persian period. Daniel, he thinks, completed his book by 528 B. C. As for the apocalyptic writings which so evidently resemble Daniel, they are to Dr. Leupold but spurious imitations. He does concede that R. H. Charles is right in fixing the date of the Aramaic of the present book of Daniel in the second century B. C. But this he thinks can be explained as mere modernization in grammatical forms and spelling, introduced by the editors when the book came to be appreciated in the Maccabean period. For then it was realized that the ancient predictions of Daniel were being fulfilled. Scientific students of the language will not follow him in this easy solution.

Throughout his book Dr. Leupold maintains an ultra-conservative approach to all problems of interpretation, even leaving the implication that the text of Daniel was preserved from all error in transmission. He rejects, for example, Septuagint variants on the assumption that confidence in the Word of God in the form in which we now have it would be undermined if they were accepted. Although a few emendations in the text are approved —a change of conjugation (p. 158), a change of person (p. 364), a change in punctuation (p. 496)—he voices, on the whole, strenuous opposition to the critical procedure of our day "which strikes the phrase it deems unnecessary," a procedure which he admits Luther unfortunately followed in his translation (p. 334).

The sincere devotion of the author to the maintenance of a high conception of Scripture is to be admired, but it is to be questioned whether he can in all fairness so sweepingly denounce everyone who fails to uphold the Daniel authorship. After all, the book itself does not claim to be written by Daniel. Not all who are willing to concede that the book of Daniel may have been written in the Maccabean period can be classed as rationalistic and oblivious to the divine message of the book. No matter who wrote it, it retains its religious value for the conservative evangelical Christian, for its comprehen-

sive view of God's world-wide dominion remains the same. Its sublime faith in God and his ability to carry out his purposes is valid for all time.

R. H. Boyd

The Snowden-Douglass Sunday School Lessons, 1952. By Earl L. Douglass. New York: Macmillan Company, 1951. 467 pages. $2.50.

Church school teachers have long found help in these practical expositions of the International Sunday School Lessons. The present volume, for the year 1952, follows the pattern which has been used for some years with apparent success.

Systematic Theology. Volume I. By Paul Tillich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951. 300 pages. $5.00.

Creative writing in systematic theology requires: (1) an understanding of, and commitment to, the basic Christian *kerygma* and the willingness to make it the starting-point and center, (2) a grasp of the contemporary situation in the light of its historical backgrounds and in the full complexity of its culture, and (3) a first-rate philosophical mind which can effectively interpret the one to the other. Paul Tillich meets these requirements. The result is a work which in creative power and depth of insight is second to none in the present century and which may well mark a new epoch in American theology. It is the *magnum opus* of a German-born theologian who had already achieved an international reputation when he came to Union Theological Seminary in 1933 and since then has done more than any other single thinker to deepen and enliven theological thinking in America. Here the stimulating ideas presented in his earlier books, such as *The Religious Situation* and *The Protestant Era,* are carefully worked out and organized into a system.

Tillich's design is nothing less than a synthesis of the "universal logos" of reason and the "concrete logos" of revelation and hence the integration of the whole range of modern culture on the basis of the transcendent resources of the Christian faith. This synthesis renders obsolete such formulations as liberalism versus orthodoxy and naturalism versus supernaturalism. Its central theme is "New Being in Jesus as the Christ," developed in terms of a fresh ontology of Christian existentialism.

Rejecting as demonic any attempt to sacrifice reason, Tillich shows revelation to be the fulfillment of reason at its greatest depth. At this depth even the question of the existence or non-existence of God becomes irrelevant, for God cannot be made into an object of knowledge. "To argue that God exists is to deny him" (p. 205). As "ground of being" or "being-itself" God precedes the entire subject-object structure. Nor can we speak of God as "a person" but rather as "the ground of the personal." The doctrine of "the ground" is not pantheistic, however, for it explicitly excludes the idea of God as "universal essence." Uniquely significant is the correlation of "being" with "courage" and of "non-being" with "anxiety." Only God can overcome our anxiety about the meaninglessness of life and give us courage to live amid the perils of our finitude.

While much of this discussion of "Reason and Revelation" and "God and Being" is necessarily epistemological and ontological, it proceeds from an unmistakably positive evangelical basis. Thus it is Christ as the concrete Logos who unites existential and rational truth. In him is ultimate reality, and in him the tragedy of life is conquered by the presence of being-itself in the finite. Natural immortality is rejected in favor of eternal life as the gift of God. And the content of the divine life is ultimately righteous and sovereign love, of which even judgment and predestination are supreme manifestations.

Lutherans who are accustomed to believing that the Bible and revelation are synonymous terms and that Reformation theology can be expressed only in the

thought-forms of seventeenth century orthodoxy will not take kindly to this new system. They will be offended by such a statement, for example, as "Probably nothing has contributed more to the misinterpretation of the biblical doctrine of the Word than the identification of the Word with the Bible" (p. 159). For Tillich "the Word of God" has a sixfold meaning: the "logos" character of the ground of being, the medium of creation, the manifestation of the divine life in the history of revelation, Jesus as the Christ, the Bible as the document of revelation, and the proclaimed message of the church.

Tillich's concept of revelation, however, is quite consistent with the dynamic dialectics of Luther and of such present-day interpreters of Luther as Aulén and Nygren. Those steeped in this kind of Lutheran thinking will not be startled when Tillich says, "The history of revelation and the history of salvation are the same history" (p. 144), and "Logos points to a revelatory reality, not to revelatory words" (p. 157). What is more startling is the substitution of "new being in Christ" for "justification by faith" as the central principle of evangelical theology. We shall have to wait for Tillich's second volume, in which he will discuss Existence and Christ, Life and the Spirit, and the History of the Kingdom, before passing judgment. There is of course no real contradiction between the two formulations, but it is easy to foresee that justification by faith will have to be given a much broader connotation than the forensic if it is to retain its basic importance in the new system.

The present volume is concerned largely with establishing the correct theological method. Tillich's procedure is to derive the questions from an existential interpretation of experience and the answers from revelation. He constantly keeps one eye on the Christian faith, the other on contemporary civilization. In accordance with this two-sidedness, he regards as the source of theology not only the Bible and church history but also the history of religion and culture. To describe his method Tillich uses the somewhat innocuous word "correlation." Actually it is more than mere correlation, for "revelation means the integration of reason" (p. 94). The author seems to wrestle with the English language, trying to compel words like "correlation" and "polarity" to carry a load of meaning beyond their maximum capacity. But he is also a kind of contemporary Kierkegaard, grappling at the very outposts of thought with problems of ultimate concern. The result is that he lands ultimately in paradoxes. Such concepts as "depth of reason" and "ground of reason" become quite unintelligible when pushed beyond the boundaries of reason itself. Similarly the "being-itself" which lies beyond existence appears too speculative an idea to express adequately the Christian concept of God. It hardly means anything more than that aspect of God which Luther designated as "Deus absconditus."

This book bristles with both insights and problems which will be discussed the world over for many decades to come. Its greatest value may lie in the fact that it raises many more questions than it solves. With its appearance American theology not only demonstrates its maturity but also moves into the front rank of constructive philosophical thinking on the Christian faith.

T. A. Kantonen

Kennen und Erkennen. By Friederich Schneider. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1949. 556 pages. DM 19.

This formidable volume, whose title might perhaps be translated "Experience and Reflection" and which is subtitled "A Textbook of Epistemology," is not written for the "general reader" or "the busy pastor" but for the serious technical student of philosophy. This category includes the philosophical theologian who is interested not only in epistemology but in such questions as the nature of the soul, the cognitive ego (*das wissende Ich*), the

bearing of epistemological idealism and realism upon man's status in the cosmos, the problem of religious cognition, etc.—all of which questions are ultimately, as our author shows, implicated in the theory of knowledge.

For students of such problems Dr. Schneider has produced in this volume a veritable compendium of epistemological discussion from the realistic standpoint that for scope, timeliness, and acute analysis ranks among the major works of our time, comparable to such predecessors as N. Hartmann's *Metaphysik der Erkenntnis* and Stumpf's *Erkenntnislehre*. In many ways this book is a German parallel to Lovejoy's *Revolt against Dualism*. The two books show, respectively for German and Anglo-American philosophy, a similar disintegration of epistemological idealism and a pronounced trend toward realism of a "critical" variety.

The author, having in an introductory section defended the significance, the possibility, and the method of epistemology against familiar forms of positivist criticism, proceeds to his main thesis in four parts. In Part I Dr. Schneider reviews in historical perspective the chief types of epistemological theory that have held the field during the post-Kantian era. The types are briefly expounded and critically evaluated. There are concise discussions of idealism, phenomenalism and positivism, and the neo-Kantian derivatives of idealism. These topics are followed by a more extended and very valuable analysis of the "critical realism" of N. Hartmann and Stumpf as set forth in the works above mentioned. In general Schneider agrees with these writers in their criticism of idealism and its characteristic drift toward phenomenalistic immanentism. For theories of this type, as our author shows, epistemic objects must, as a consequence, be given a factitious "objectivity" by some process (a la Kant) of mental "synthesis," "construction," "projection," etc.

Dr. Schneider submits these theories—not excepting Hartmann's residual phenomenalism—to two lines of acute criticism. Negatively, he exposes the fallacies that result from exploiting the ambiguities of the *"Satz des Bewusstseins,"* that is, the pseudo-axiom of the primacy of self-consciousness *which, in principle, knows only its own contents*. In England, the late Archbishop Temple has made similar points against what he dubbed "the Cartesian *faux pas*," and in America Perry has exposed this fallacy even more trenchantly as the "fallacy of the ego-centric predicament." The positive ground of the author's critique of the immanentism involved in the *"Satz des Bewusstseins"* is the fundamental distinction he draws between the psychological process of perception (*Wahrnehmen*) and imagination (*Vorstellen*). This distinction is the basis of the contrasted forms of cognition, "experience" vs. "reflection," which gives title to the book, and it is therefore the crux on which the author's criticism of other theories and his own systematic exposition of realism is based. The outcome of this Part is to indicate a strong drift toward realism (§ 13, p. 171). English readers will be interested to note that whereas American "critical realism" (generally) interprets the mediating sensa of perception as subjective, thus leading to epistemological dualism, Dr. Schneider interprets the sensa as relative attributes of the physical *object*. He thus seeks—at least as far as *Kennen*, if not *Erkennen*, is concerned—to adhere to epistemological monism.

In Part II the author discusses the bearing of recent psychology on epistemology. The contribution of Gestalt psychology is treated at some length, followed by a consideration of the epistemic significance of illusions and after-images. Central, for the author's standpoint is the topic *Wahrnehmung und Vorstellung*, the importance of which I have indicated above. The issues are further discussed in Part III, § 41, entitled "The Nature of Reflection," wherein the author shows how the *Vorstellung*—and its derivative the *Begriff* (concept)—are abstracted from the *Wahrnehmung*. Reflection is al-

ways a schematic reduction of experience to a so-called "acosmic" status, that is, it is no longer a direct apprehension of the ontal, and may therefore combine its elements veridically or arbitrarily as suits the purpose of the thinker.

In Part III we arrive at Dr. Schneider's "Systematic Establishment of Realism." The discussion divides into two sections (A) *Kennen* (experience or direct perception) and (B) *Erkennen* (conceptual reflection). The author shows convincingly that *Kennen* is primary and fundamental. It is our contact with the "cosmos." All *Erkennen* is secondary and derivative. It is in no sense originative, but is limited to elements of the given which may be combined in endless permutations. Schneider's view corresponds closely to William James' well-known contrast between "acquaintance with" and "knowledge about." The core of the author's theory is found in this Part, but the arguments are too involved to be reproduced here in detail. In general, the conclusion is established that the alleged solipsistic predicament of the *"Satz des Bewusstseins"* is gratuitious because of a persistent confusion of *Kennen* and *Erkennen*. Hence the elaborate engineering that aims to construct a bridge from the subjective to the objective is largely a solution of a fictitious problem. There is an incisive treatment of "The Ontological Reference of Cognition" (§ 29) and "The Modes of Givenness" (§ 35). An important original feature of Dr. Schneider's realism is developed in §§ 32-36, in which he seeks to establish the relational and ontological independence of cognition (*Wissen*), and the casual transcendence of the Self or Ego (*Ich*). On the basis of the conclusions reached in these sections, Dr. Schneider sharply distinguishes the cognitive subject, the *Ich,* from the soul. Whereas the soul is involved in the mediating processes of psycho-physical interaction, the *Ich* stands above all this as the ground of the transcendental unity of experience.

In Part IV the bearing of his epistemology on metaphysical issues is briefly discussed. Dr. Schneider shows that in slurring over the distinction between a purely *receptive* knowledge (*Kennen*) and a constructive consciousness (*Erkennen*), epistemology supported modern man's delusions of metaphysical and cosmic autonomy. It thus helped to reinforce man's "will to power" and the revolt against his creaturely dependence. The issues are discussed under the headings "The Understanding of Man," "The Problem of the Soul," "The Cosmological Problem."

I repeat that this book is a treasure-trove for the philosophical student. While the author limits himself to the German literature and shows no familiarity with important English and American writers, such as Blanshard, Broad, Price, Lovejoy, etc., this is no serious defect since the problems in both camps are strikingly similar. The book, therefore, clearly indicates how general is the contemporary recession from 19th century idealism toward a critically restated realism. This fact certainly indicates an important cultural mutation. Appropriately, the author honors his eminent teacher, Prof. Rothacker, by dedicating the work to him on his 60th birthday.

W. O. Doescher

The Illusion of Immortality. By Corliss Lamont. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Second Edition, 316 pages. $3.95.

This is a fortified edition of the greatest attack upon all expectation of a future life. It is a striking reminder of the important and universal fact of secularism. Nevertheless, Lutherans will find much with which they heartily agree, in particular the rejection of ascetic renunciation of the bodily life and rejection of the cult of otherwordly immortality which has continually crept into Christianity from Greek idealism. On the other hand, we are startled over Mr. Lamont's "discovery" of a conflict between the Chris-

tian "resurrection" as a divine victory over death and the Platonic "immortality" of a soul which needs no God to give it life or health. That this conflict was already a battle-cry of gifted theologians like Irenaeus seems to have missed the author's historical scholarship entirely. St. Augustine is quoted as insisting on the resurrection being the *distinctive* faith of Christians. But the author completely misses the point that the resurrection is in bitter conflict with the deification of man in immortality, and so regards Augustine's point as illustrating the importance of "immortality" in Christianity itself. We must confess, however, that Mr. Lamont's evidence proves that modern theologians are quite as confused as he. Therefore, one of the great values of this book is its demand that everyone do clear thinking in this very confused field.

One thing which is here very well demonstrated is that many "Christians" are not willing to accept eternal life as a gracious *gift* of God, but demand immortality of the Universe on the ground that they deserve it. The author is correct in saying that this demotes God to the role of an instrument, and transforms the penitent sinner into a presumptuous egoist.

What of the resurrection doctrine itself? Lamont is inclined to regard it as more defensible than immortality because it makes a future life meaningful from the standpoint of spatio-temporal events and because it furnishes an "environment" (the universe itself) for the future life. Yet he rejects this as crudely anthropomorphic. Doubtless Mr. Lamont is not sufficiently critical, for the resurrection doctrine has always used the spatio-temporal situation and a materialistic heaven not as literally descriptive of eternal life but only as suggestive of the possible meanings of the heavenly "mansions" which Jesus mentions. Further, Mr. Lamont is too critical, for the anthropomorphism to which he objects is inescapable. We can think only with available ideas, and while the present sense-empirical experiences are not adequate as description of a heavenly (perfected) life, the promise of eternal life must express itself in such terms if it is expressed at all.

Finally, what is the accuracy of interpretation of the religious mood? There is dignity and justice in the book, yet the author is prone to contrast the noblest elements in naturalistic humanism with the most ignoble that have masqueraded as religion. Religion thus becomes "wish-fulfillment." Yet to identify Christianity, with its *agape* and its historical facts of generous, unscheming sacrifice with egotism, and on the contrary to identify materialism (including Russian) and humanism with altruistic devotion appears to be a monumental error of historical judgment and logical analysis.

When we turn from the specific Christian interest in the issue we find that much of the treatment is scientific and philosophical. The amazing intricacy of the cortex is made the explanation of consciousness, to which a very simple objection can be raised. The intricacy of the network does not make a telephone system any more capable of experiencing pain or love than is a single molecule of copper in one wire.

Philosophically, Mr. Lamont represents a popular naturalistic and monistic trend. Yet he involves himself in serious difficulties which beset any monism. He deplores the perverse opinion which creates an epistemological dualism of ideas plus physical things, which two must then be put into relationship. But that ideas are indeed actual objects-to-self, and that physical aggregations of atoms are "known" in terms of states of consciousness is a simple and elemental fact of experience, far from being an invention of an "idealist." Lamont does not solve the problem of dual things-and-experiences. He only denies that there is a problem.

Lamont is not a behaviorist. For him experience is real and important but it is a "function" of the brain, even though experience in turn affects bodily events.

"Non-material meanings" or ideas are a part of "nature." But then nature is *ipso facto* not entirely matter, whether one calls the residue "soul" or simply refuses to give it a name. While non-material ideas thus control bodies, Lamont thinks that immaterial "souls" could not do so. Thus the author is very spiritual; his "nature" can do all the things which souls are expected to do—be conscious, virtuous, devoted to reason, *et al.* Only, nature performing these spiritual functions must not be called spirit, and it must not be permitted to maintain its integrated identity in enduring personalities. Mr. Lamont is monistic in intention, but astoundingly he finds no difficulty in naming the cause of dissociation as sometimes physical, sometimes *psychical.* He thinks that the extraordinary thing is that there should be any thinking at all, not that a material body should think. Now it is of course precisely this *thinking* or experiencing that most of us have in mind when we talk about a self or soul. That it is psychical in nature Mr. Lamont and we agree, and that the body is much involved in its operation we all agree. Our difference is that Mr. Lamont insists that this marvel is a passing product of integrated matter, while some of us have been persuaded that God has intended to create permanent value in and through this marvel of selfhood, whatever be the nature of the created "substance," if substance there be.

Matters of special concern to the theologian would surely include the following in this argument: (1) The *semantic* problem of meaning. How can "heaven" be made meaningful (with aesthetic, social, and moral values) without involving problems of imperfection, disorder, drabness, need, and evil? In other words, is it possible to have a "heaven" *meaning* or idea? (2) The *behavioral* problem of an environment. It is unavailing to say that we should not wait for heaven somewhere else. The issue is not whether heaven can come to earth as God's reign, but rather what the nature of an environment for an eternal life might be? If the universe itself be the environment, then the resurrected Christian is in danger of appearing as a superman involved with electronics and endangered by space ships. If the universe is not to be the heavenly environment, then the resurrected person has no place to go, no work to do, and nothing to cherish for physical beauty. We do not know that a spirit could *not* have an exclusively spiritual situation or "environment," but Christianity has expressed spirit in terms of cups of cold water, so that an immaterial environment is simply meaningless. It may be true that God will reveal that heaven is non-material, but at present we simply can not imagine its meanings and possibilities, nor how there could be continuity between our behavioral personalities and souls taken out of a behavioral environment. Thus the dilemma becomes a choice between an inadequate environment and an environment which we can in no way imagine. (3) The *scientific* problem, which does reveal mind's profound interrelationship with body, and in particular with the brain. This issue is of great importance for the advocates of immortality, but of relatively little importance from the standpoint of the Christian restoration or resurrection of the whole personality. (4) The *historical* problem of the dependability of the account of Christ's resurrection, not as a "symbol" of the immortality of the soul—which it is for some of the immortalists—but as the basis for the Christian faith and hope in God's victory over death, his enemy and man's.

Noting, finally, the author's painstaking care to point to many and genuine inconsistencies in those he criticizes (ranging from Plato to Fosdick and from Spiritualists to Catholics) one cannot but indulge in irony. Mr. Lamont thinks that extinction is not evil, but he hopes that science can postpone extinction for some people almost indefinitely.

GEORGE B. ARBAUGH

The Dignity of Man. By Lynn Harold Hough. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 143 pages. $1.75.

As usual, it is a literary treat to read a new volume from Lynn Harold Hough's pen. In vibrant English, moving style, and graphic metaphors the reader is swept along the intellectual path ready to say yes to almost everything. On closer scrutiny, however, one must pause to weigh some of the deeper implications. Some of these the reviewer found wanting.

Though not a formal theological treatise, this definitely belongs in the field of Christian anthropology. In twenty brief chapters Dr. Hough moves rapidly from "The Divine Image" to "That which is not Subject to Destruction," i.e. eternal life. This reviewer gathers his remarks about four cardinal aspects of this small volume:

1. "The distinctive quality of man comes from that creative intelligence in which his life has its source. Man is made in the divine image" (p. 8). "Man is made in the moral as well as the intellectual image (metaphysical some would say) of God" (p. 9). The author suggests that the approach found in the first chapter of Genesis is sounder than any scientific-naturalistic interpretation. So far so good. Now the more conservative theologian struggles with the old humanist and the result is this: "He (man) is living intelligence, mastering and using experience. And the responsibility for making his will a good will is implicit in the activity of his mind" (p. 10). At this point the reviewer feels that the author loses his perspective because of his concept of sin, its origin, place, and power in man's life. Lutherans here would deal with sin and its effect on man's total personality. Man's loss through sin is more than the loss of his sense of values and the result more than confused thinking. It is the loss of the very "Image of God" which alone guarantees the "Dignity of Man."

2. The Origin of Sin. This seems to be the weakest phase of the book. "Sin in the very nature of the case must be the deliberate doing of wrong which is recognized to be wrong in a situation where it would be possible to choose and do that which is wrong." It is not implied that this refers to "original sin" but to man's complete freedom of action always. To this the reviewer must object. Man no longer has complete freedom of action. Sin takes care of that. Dr. Hough utterly ignores the biblical account of the fall at this point. For whatever one's approach be to the Genesis account, it alone gives the true religious angle and emphasis. The whole treatment of evil and especially of sin reflects the author's Arminian and Humanistic leanings. Says Dr. Hough: "The man who was made in the divine image is so constructed that the call to goodness finds an ally in his own heart"; certainly not without the assistance of the grace of God.

3. Redemption. Dr. Hough writes some beautiful things about the cross and the Christ, as this: "In the cross God meets sinful man and rebuilds the 'dignity of man'"; or "The Son of God entered human life and without ceasing to be God became genuinely man" (p. 76); or "His (Christ's) death is the supreme and overwhelming act of the suffering of God." But there is no reference to the real heart, the redemptive, reconciling power of the cross. The persuasive love of the cross is not the whole story.

4. Christian Fellowship. Man in his freedom has made "The Terrible Choice," engulfing all mankind in "The Fellowship of Disintegration" (ch. XIV). The answer to this is "The Fellowship of Divine Grace." This is not a mere moral code, but the expression of a spirit, the Spirit of God. It in turn creates "The Fellowship of the Forgiven." The author is at his best here except for the fact that there is no real reference to the Holy Spirit in this whole experience of sinful man, as well as in the "Social Action" that must follow.

Finally man who belongs to this fellow-

ship is also destined for eternity. "You must think of him (man) sub specie aeternitatis if you are to think of him adequately" (p. 137). "For when the sense of eternity is lost, deep and real meaning begins to disappear" (p. 139).

Dr. Hough is pleasant reading, rich in thought and literary allusions from classic as well as modern sources. The man who reads with discretion can be much benefited by this little volume.

JAMES J. RAUN

Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist. By Walter A. Kaufmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. $6.00.

Addressed, as the preface indicates, to the general reader as well as the scholar, this book is the most substantial work on Nietzsche to appear in the English language. Its four hundred pages represent careful scholarship and the most astute use of critical faculties. The book is polemical in tone and gives the reader opportunity to see Nietzsche's arguments in juxtaposition to Socrates, Christianity, Hegel, Kant, and many others. In addition, Professor Kaufmann's arguments about Nietzsche are juxtaposed to those of Nietzsche's sister, Crane Brinton, Morgan, Wright, and others. A capacity to discern dispassionately the passionate commitments of Nietzsche and his interpreters gives Mr. Kaufmann's work a certain delicacy which is not characteristic of most studies of Nietzsche. The numerous quotations from the German texts are translated by the author, and these plus the new translations of titles and poems (pp. 369-381) are a testimony to the skill of the author and to the need for new translations of the German philosopher's works.

Many general views, shared perhaps by the non-specialists, are severely criticized. The contention that Nietzsche was anti-Semitic is dispatched with delightful acumen (especially pp. 261-267); the attempts to justify the use of Nietzsche and his works for Nazi purposes are handled, not by whitewashing Nietzsche by reference to his exemplary personal life, but rather by careful analysis of the texts and their interpretation by Bäumler, Oehler, Rosenberg, and Brinton; the vulgar summary of Nietzsche as the iconoclast of all the values of Western culture and Christianity is treated not directly but instead is rendered absurd by the entire book. The careful attention paid to the development of Nietzsche's thought enables the reader to discover growing themes in the literature and thus avoid injudicious use of single and otherwise enigmatical works. Mr. Kaufmann is not unique among scholars for having said these things, but the absence of the defense-attorney attitude makes his positions a little more credible.

The specific points where Kaufmann addresses himself to the Nietzsche scholars can only be mentioned. The Apollinian-Dionysian distinction which has been utilized by some scholars to construe the entire authorship is shown here to be subject to development and modification (cf. pp. 106 ff.). With its modifications admitted it becomes not a journalistic device but an insight most useful to the history of philosophy. Historical scholarship is adduced (e.g., Cornford, p. 128) to show that Nietzsche was not as wanton as the loose use of this distinction and others has made some readers assume. That Nietzsche admired Socrates, and why he did so (pp. 350 ff.), puts a different construction upon his criticisms of philosophy and most philosophers. Perhaps most striking of all is Kaufmann's detective work in the Nietzsche literature. Instead of assuming that *The Will to Power* is the "unwritten philosophy" and the metaphysics toward which all the rest were adumbrations, Kaufmann discloses the circumstances of publication and the persuasions of the editor, Elizabeth Förster Nietzsche. The creation of the "Nietzsche legend" (pp. 3-17), for which she and a few others were responsible, is assessed and the consequences for the understanding of the philosopher duly noted. That

The Will to Power was not the last work, that the values of the sister and the brother were not commensurate, that the "George Kreis" was not representative of Nietzsche, and that Nietzsche was not interested in a new mythology even in *Thus Spake Zarathustra*—these negations are shown to be extremely important to the interpretation of the total work.

The effort to establish values on a non-supernaturalistic, non-mythical basis is said to be Nietzsche's constant aim. The care lavished on his writings to show that this is his interest puts his anti-religiosity and anti-conventionalism in a better light. Nietzsche affirms as well as denies. Nietzsche's "experimentalism" does not presuppose atheism but rather seeks to steer between asserting God's existence and other-worldly values or denying God's existence and having no values at all. Nietzsche wishes to show that there are values even if the state, class, society, and religious sanctions are gone. This places Nietzsche rather clearly in the middle of contemporary debate concerning value theory. For if the individual is responsible for the values chosen and if values are not given as empirical objects are, then we have in Nietzsche a thinker who said what many since his day have said without his literary skill.

Despite the generally high performance marking this work, there are several points which seem unwarranted. The attempt to compare Hegel and Nietzsche (pp. 211 ff.) seems inappropriate. It certainly must be the case that the differences are more important than the similarities. And to be told on behalf of Nietzsche that systems are "good" (p. 60) and about "the most unkindest cut of all" (p. 37)—these indicate lapses in linguistic usage. The discussion about the symbolic value that marriage to Katharina had for Luther, that celibacy had for Kierkegaard, and that the "deliberate and allegorically significant breach with Wagner" had for Nietzsche (all on p. 137), all of this is certainly nonsensical. By what right we can interpret these deeds to be symbolic is not discussed but it certainly deserves to be before taken seriously. The suggestion that there is a solution to the problem of values (p. 169) suggests a confusion between the existential order and the order of reflection. A "solution" in one order may not imply solution in the other. The references to Kierkegaard are misleading throughout. Kierkegaard never did leap into dogma, nor is his debt to Schelling for the criticism of Hegel very great (pp. 94 and 102-103)! Nor did Kierkegaard—or for that matter William James—argue that happiness is relevant to the question of propositional truth. A great deal of discernment is necessary here, but suffice it to say that Kierkegaard at least argued that the truths of religion and ethics were not propositional; hence the definition, truth is subjectivity.

With all of these things acknowledged, this book is one of the finest fruits of American philosophical scholarship. It is a temperate and thoroughly courageous work. The assessment of Nietzsche's critiques of religion concludes this work (chapter XII), and Kaufmann's treatment gives ample justification to Nietzsche's assertion that "the most serious Christians have always been well disposed toward me." Nietzsche remains one of the most passionate students of things human in the history of the world, and this book gives him opportunity to make himself apparent to the contemporary reader, religious or irreligious.

PAUL L. HOLMER

Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist. Edited by Paul A. Schilpp. Evanston, Ill.: The Library of Living Philosophers, Inc., 1950.

In 1939 Professor Paul Schilpp of Northwestern University began a series of books which has come to be acknowledged as one of the really significant contributions to world scholarship in the twentieth century. His volumes on Dewey, Santayana, Whitehead, Moore, Russell, and Cassirer set extremely high standards,

and any student of contemporary thought —certainly of philosophy—dare hardly admit ignorance of their contents. The present book is of the same quality, and its 778 pages, though sometimes difficult reading, even for the scientist and philosopher, are consistently rewarding. If one wishes to know what Einstein stands for, how he "got that way," and how he would himself defend his views, this is *par excellence* the work to purchase and ponder. Like its predecessors, it contains two essays on Einstein by world scholars, his "Reply to Critics," an intellectual autobiography, pictures of him, a complete bibliography of his writings to 1949, and a useful index. It is a magnificent piece of scholarship. There is so much within it of significance for religion that the book really calls for a full article. At this point we can only review some of its central items.

Einstein's autobiography — which (at age 67) he calls his obituary—is a clear and, in Professor Schilpp's translation, exceedingly readable description of his life and convictions. There is no false modesty. He says he was "a fairly precocious young man" and that in spite of the fact of his "entirely irreligious (Jewish) parents," he came to "a deep religiosity." From twelve years of age on he had a profound interest in mathematics, physics, and philosophy, especially epistemology. He describes, in his characteristically staccato style, the development of his views on the special and general theory of relativity, his quest for a formula which would deal with the problem of gravitation, and the way in which, in various theories, he agrees with and differs from contemporary theoretical physicists of world-fame.

What *are* his basic insights? In seeking a brief answer to this question, I recall the statement of Dr. Neureth, made at Northwestern University on March 2, 1939, to a number of philosophy students. He said that when Einstein had recently returned from Europe he was met at the gangplank by a somewhat impertinent reporter who asked him to state in a sentence or two "what this relativity theory is all about." It is probably a mark of Einstein's genius that, as the report goes, he pondered the question for a moment and then answered in a single sentence in words to this effect. "In Newtonian physics if you remove all entities you have space and time left; in relativity, if you remove all entities you have nothing left." If his listeners knew much at all about the philosophy of science they must have realized that only a brilliant mind could have given so clear and succinct an answer. The reply, of course, forms an excellent "text" which could be explained, documented, and illustrated. But the careful reader of this volume can see that he fixed precisely upon the heart of the matter. In what follows I shall briefly comment upon two major themes which have special importance for philosophy and religion.

First, what is Einstein's conception of science? Several lessons which he might be said to teach his contemporaries are important. For one thing, he is at pains to point out what he believes to be the errors of positivism. In substance this means that Einstein rejects the positivistic view that all theoretical meanings derive from empirical meanings. If the latter were true, the consequences of positivism for philosophy, religion, and other studies, as well as for science, would be radical indeed. Many scientists and philosophers, of course, are vocal exponents of this positivistic viewpoint. They would have us believe that really to be scientific means to be positivistic, and that this involves denying genuine knowledge about *any* "realities" other than those capable of sense verification. If so, the Kantian thing-in-itself, or the god of classical religion, simply cannot scientifically be known and discussed. It is of great importance that Einstein here emphatically rejects this extreme position. Epistemology and ontology as understood in pre-positivistic thought is thereby, according to Einstein, restored to scientific and philosophical

thinking. To be sure, Einstein believes that valid propositions are scientifically verifiable propositions: their truth must be confirmed by empirical data; but this *can* be done.

Another point closely related to this is that Einstein constantly emphasizes the role of construction and imagination in science. Many educated people still assume, as did the "natural philosophers" of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that "the fundamental concepts and postulates of physics were not in a logical sense free inventions of the human mind, but could be deduced from experience by 'abstraction'—that is to say, by logical means" (p. 273). This shows that they have a very prosaic (and erroneous) view of the nature of scientific thinking, holding, as they do, that the scientist merely observes and records innumerable "facts" and then draws a logical and inevitable conclusion in the light of them. Not so. Theories are a construct of the mind. Great *imagination* is demanded in their construction, as well as great skill in testing and constantly improving them. Two or more essentially different principles, moreover, may both correspond with experience; hence, the assumption that only one conclusion can rigidly be drawn obviously is false. It appears that, as Whitehead was in the habit of warning, the scientist must be much more of a poet and much less of a mere statistician than we commonly suppose. Concepts, then, are the free creation of the mind, according to Einstein.

A third point about his theory of science is its emphasis upon the necessity of seeking that most basic principle—or set of principles—in the light of which *all* reality may be understood. In one respect this serves as a correction of the widespread impression, that, ideally, the scientist comes to know more and more about less and less until eventually, as the classroom joke has it, he knows everything about nothing. Clearly, this is nonsense, and dangerous. It is the former because it logically should say "more and more about more and more," for even with the specialization that is being ridiculed, the total body of knowledge obviously increases. It is dangerous, moreover, because it misconceives and burlesques the legitimate aim of science, which is to discover those most fundamental insights which will explain all phenomena. Precisely this is Einstein's present task, and although we cannot discuss it at length, that task as he is now engaged upon it may be briefly stated as follows. The general and special theory of relativity sought, as early as 1916, to give a simpler and more accurate explanation of planetary activity. It did so. He writes: "This [the quantum theory] is the only theory at present which permits a *unitary grasp of experiences*. . . . (Italics mine, p. 81.) These theories, however, are not yet the end, because what we now need is a gravitational theory so basic and simple that it will undergird all other more specialized theories. So, Einstein writes, "A theory is the more impressive the greater the simplicity of its premises is, the more different the kinds of things it relates, and the more extended is its area of applicability" (p. 33). Theoretical science seeks ever to "reduce the concepts for a field of knowledge to as simple and as few irreducible basic elements as possible." In line with this demand of science, and hardly a year after the present volume appeared, Einstein modestly announced a "Generalized Theory of Gravitation." This proved to be nothing short of an attempt to interrelate all physical phenomena of the universe in one grand concept. The quantum theory explains what happens in the atom, but it does not explain what occurs in the universe. Likewise, relativity does not explain everything that occurs in an atom. Hence, as Waldemar Kaempffert, the brilliant science editor of the *New York Times,* writes, "We have two kinds of physics—one for the atom, another for the universe. If this conflict can be reconciled, the human mind will have scored its greatest success" (*The New York Times,*

Jan. 1, 1950, Sect. IV, p. 7, Col. 6). Without debating the last phrase of the quotation, the fact is that Einstein now tentatively suggests a generalized theory which may resolve this ultimate conflict. A fundamental principle thus may have been discovered which also shows the harmony between thought and reality.

We bring our discussion to a close with comments on Einstein's religious and social views. In so doing, we must say at once that, although he has never systematically presented a religious, ethical, or social philosophy, his keen interest in and many statements upon these issues have had enormous influence. Virgil G. Hinshaw, Jr., quotes Einstein in the Schilpp volume as follows: "Concern for man himself and his fate must always form the chief interest of all technical endeavors" (p. 649). This is a fine way of epitomizing Einstein's conviction that values are central in science and in life.

Concerning the implications of Einstein's views for religion and ethics, the most important statement to be made is that the many writers who have said that the theory of relativity implies a relativism of man's duties and rights are categorically *wrong*. The relativity of space is a cognitive question, restricted to the area of physical science. An analogy in the field of religion and ethics is extremely dangerous, and Einstein *never* makes it.

When Einstein was asked by Rabbi H. S. Goldstein, "Do you believe in God?" Einstein cabled from Europe, "I believe in Spinoza's God, who reveals himself in the harmony of all being, not in a God who concerns himself with the fate and actions of men" (pp. 103 and 660). Neither atheist nor agnostic, Einstein has repeatedly shown an eagerness to see truth and cooperation expressed in all human relations. His concern has been that "the creations of our mind shall be a blessing and not a curse to mankind" (p. 650).

In ethical and social issues, his position has been so well publicized that it need not be reviewed. The real problem today, as he entitled one of his articles, is in the hearts of man. Our defense, he said on another occasion, is not in armaments, nor in science, but in law and order. An eventual world state is necessary for survival, he believes. In short, Einstein is convinced that the order and harmony of God and his universe must increasingly be expressed in the thought and lives of men. As a citizen, the scientist must labor (as Einstein himself has done) to promote order, understanding, and good-will. In his life he has shown that he humbly seeks to practice what he preaches.

CHARLES W. KEGLEY

Herdabrev till Uppsala ärkestift. By Yngve Brilioth. Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelses bokförlag, 1950. 195 pages. Kr. 7:50.

Perhaps the most fitting comment that could be made about this volume is that if this reviewer were a pastor in the Church of Sweden, this is exactly the kind of a "letter" he would like to get from his archbishop. It is such as to inspire confidence and loyalty. It wrestles with the great issues of our time in a way that is both profoundly incisive and refreshingly comprehensive. It assesses the church situation in Sweden with realistic honesty and sensitive understanding. It breathes a sympathetic appreciation of the pastor's problems without allowing him to feel sorry for himself. There is boldness that does not hesitate to address itself to the government and proposes specific reforms to safeguard the church. There are practical suggestions for the parish pastor and for the various activities and organizations within the church. A deep and genuine spirituality pervades the entire discussion. The conscientious and devoted pastor could not but feel that in the "shepherd" from whom this "shepherd-letter" comes he has a true friend, counselor, and champion.

Archbishop Brilioth has distinguished himself in the field of scholarship over

many years. His excellent volume, *Eucharistic Faith and Practise*, has almost attained the position of a classic in the field of worship. His studies in the Anglican tradition have led some to infer that he has high-churchly tendencies but they are not especially apparent in this volume. On the contrary, one has a feeling that any such tangential tendencies in the Swedish Church come in for gentle censure.

After a devotional preface there is a brief autobiographical sketch. Then follows an excellent section on our "shattered culture," with well-informed references to various types of existentialism, a fine analysis of the role of individualism in the Christian conception of society, and the dangers inherent in ethical relativism. A section dealing with "the sundered church and the church's unity" should leave no doubts regarding the ecumenical inclination of the new archbishop nor of the sound evangelical basis on which it rests. An Augustana Lutheran notes with interest and appreciation that a hand is stretched out in its direction. It is suggested that it would be highly desirable to have a regular exchange of pastors and theological students between the Swedish Church and Augustana.

The major portion of the volume is, of course, directed to problems and programs which directly, and perhaps uniquely, affect the Swedish Church. Movements within the church life of Sweden are dealt with in a generous spirit. The theological situation is analyzed, somewhat critically. Due credit is given for the thorough and widely recognized studies in several fields of theological discourse, but it is regrettable that "contemporary theologians find it so difficult to have a meeting of minds with thinking people" outside the field of theology (94). He feels that contact must be established with the lay-mind to a much greater degree than is now the case.

EDGAR M. CARLSON

Renaissance to Reformation. By Albert Hyma. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951. 591 pages. $6.00.

The Dutch-American scholar (University of Michigan), who in earlier works has enriched our knowledge of the Christian humanists before and during the Reformation, here writes on a broader canvas. The title of the book should not mislead the reader to expect a comprehensive survey of the Renaissance and Reformation in the fashion of Henry Lucas. Instead, Professor Hyma offers us a volume of essays on certain political, economic, social, and religious phases of the period in which he develops his own views over against those of other historians from Denifle to John A. O'Brien and from Burckhardt to Toynbee. Most attention is devoted to Erasmus, Luther, and Calvin, but other men and ideas (notably Max Weber's theory of capitalism and Calvinism) are also discussed.

The essays are written in an engaging style and are marred only by typographical errors and by frequent excursuses which suggest the lecture hall. The author's point of view is transparently Calvinistic and Dutch, but he is reasonably fair in his treatment of non-Calvinistic and non-Dutch figures and positions (including Roman Catholic). Those, especially, who are not acquainted with Hyma's earlier monographs, now out of print, will find this book a good introduction to his interpretation of the period.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

CONTRIBUTORS

Richard Kroner is professor of philosophy of religion at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, and Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Anton Fridrichsen is professor of theology at Uppsala University, Sweden.

Charles M. Cooper is professor of Old Testament at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bertha M. Paulssen is professor of Christian Sociology and Psychology at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

William George Arbaugh is secretary for Latin America Board of American Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America.

C. Umhau Wolf is professor of Old Testament at Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Ill.

Among the contributors of book reviews in this number are Russell D. Snyder, professor of the New Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; Melvin A. Helland, professor of the New Testament in Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis; H. C. Leupold, professor of the Old Testament in Capital University Theological Seminary, Columbus; Robert A. Boyd, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; T. A. Kantonen, professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; Waldemar O. Doescher, professor of Philosophy in Capital University, Columbus; George B. Arbaugh, professor of Philosophy in Augustana College, Rock Island; James J. Raun, professor of Systematic Theology in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis; Paul L. Holmer, department of Philosophy in the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Charles W. Keegley, professor of Philosophy in Wagner College, Staten Island, N. Y.; Edgar M. Carlson, president of Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Editor
CONRAD BERGENDOFF
Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor
THEODORE S. LIEFELD
Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager
ANDREW S. BURGESS
Luther Seminary, Como Ave. and Luther Place, St. Paul, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pa.

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa.

Augustana Theological Seminary
Rock Island, Ill.

Capital University Theological Seminary
Columbus, Ohio

Wartburg Theological Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Luther Theological Seminary
St. Paul, Minn.

Augsburg Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Central Seminary
Fremont, Neb.

Chicago Lutheran Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada
Waterloo, Ont.

Grandview Seminary
Des Moines, Iowa

Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

Lutheran Seminary
Saskatoon, Sask.

Northwestern Lutheran Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Southern Lutheran Seminary
Columbia, S. C.

Suomi Seminary
Hancock, Mich.

Trinity Seminary
Blair, Neb.

VOLUME III

1951

Times and News Publishing Co.

Index to Volume III

I. AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS

ABERLY, J.
Review of: Bammel, *Das heilige Mahl* ... 238
ALLBECK, W. D.
Review of: Lentz et al., *Story of the Midwest Synod* ... 111
ARBAUGH, GEORGE B.
Review of: Lamont, *The Illusion of Immortality* ... 422
ARBAUGH, WILLIAM GEORGE
Evangelical Witness in Latin America ... 393
AUS, G.
Reviews of: Heim, *Leading a Sunday Church School* ... 113
Wedel, *The Christianity of Main Street* ... 115
Baillie, *The Belief in Progress* ... 316
BERGENDOFF, CONRAD
Wanted: A Theory of the Laity in the Lutheran Church ... 82
Reviews of: Lindroth, *Recent Theological Research in Sweden* ... 106
Malmeström, *J. A. Eklund, En biografi* ... 112
Rutenber, *The Dagger and the Cross* ... 116
Hök, *Herrnhutisk Teologi i Svensk Gestalt* ... 231
Karlström, *Ekumeniska Preludier* ... 326
Brilioth, *Nattvarden i evangeliskt gudstjänstliv* ... 412
BERKEMEYER, W. C.
Reviews of: Magary, *Saints Without Halos* ... 223
Cailliet and Blankenagel (trans.), *Pascal's Short Life of Christ* ... 331
BOYD, R. H.
Review of: Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* ... 417
BROWN, JR., EDGAR S.
Episcopacy and the Lutheran Church ... 278
BUEHRING, P. H.
Reviews of: Barr, *Monk in Armour* ... 227
Oxnam, *The Church and Contemporary Change* ... 319
CARLFELT, C. G.
Reviews of: Richardson, *The Gospel and Modern Thought* ... 233
Asmark, *Ambetet i den Svenska Kyrkan* ... 318
CARLSON, E. M.
Reviews of: Williams, *God's Grace and Man's Hope* ... 98
Brilioth, *Herdabrev till Uppsala ärkestift* ... 430
CARLSON, OSCAR W.
Review of: Wisloff, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* ... 315
COOPER, CHARLES M.
Reviews of. Lofts, *Esther* ... 217
Silver, *The Way to God* ... 238
Msgr. Knox's Old Testament in English ... 366
COOPER, W. H.
Review of: Meek, *Hebrew Origins* ... 213
CREAGER, H. L.
Reviews of: Williamson, *Moses Who First Saw Our Pyramid of Life* ... 216
Knudson, *Basic Issues in Christian Thought* ... 323
DOBERSTEIN, JOHN W.
Review of: Kunze, *Die gottesdienstliche Schriftlesung* ... 334
DOESCHER, W. O.
Reviews of: Swenson, *The Faith of a Scholar* ... 327
Schneider, *Kennen und Erkennen* ... 420
DRACH, GEORGE
President or Bishop ... 206

ENGELBRECHT, A. J.
Review of: Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* — 212
FENDT, E. C.
Review of: Ramsey, *Basic Christian Ethics* — 233
FISCHER, R. H.
Review of: Stapel, *Luthers Lieder und Gedichte* — 228
FLACK, E. E.
Reviews of: Wilder, *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus* — 95
Echternach, *Der Kommende* — 118
Little, *Explanation of the Book of Revelation* — 222
FLOREEN, HAROLD
A Lutheran Singapore — 167
FORELL, GEORGE W.
Review of: Bokser, *The Legacy of Maimonides* — 326
FRIDRICHSEN, ANTON
Jesus, John, Paul (Part I) — 243
Jesus, John, Paul (Part II) — 353
GRIMM, HAROLD J.
Reformation Research — 313
HAYS, A. C. P.
Review of: Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* — 91
HEICK, O. W.
Review of: Franke, *Evangelischer Aufbruch* — 117
HEIKKINEN, J. W.
Reviews of: Moe, *The Apostle Paul: His Life and Work* — 221
Verkuyl, *Berkeley Version of the New Testament* — 330
HEIM, RALPH D.
A New Paragraph in Christian History — 79
Review of: Hay, *Blind Spot in Public Education* — 237
HEINECKEN, M. J.
Reviews of: Heim, *Gottesglaube und die Naturwissenschaft* — 103
Caemerer, *The Church in the World* — 106
HELLAND, MELVIN A.
Review of: Smith, *On Whom the Spirit Came* — 414
HERMAN, STEWART
The Background of Lutheran Participation in the Ecumenical Movement — 34
HERTZ, KARL H.
Christian Higher Education and the Social Sciences — 182
HOH, PAUL J.
Reviews of: Fleming, *Living as Comrades* — 321
Herzel, *More Than Bread* — 335
HOLMER, P. L.
Spirit in the Thought of Nicholas Berdyaev — 3
Review of: Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* — 426
HOOVER, H. D.
Review of: Allport, *The Individual and his Religion* — 113
HULME, WILLIAM E.
Christian Liberty and Spiritual Growth — 23
JAUERNIG, R.
The Weimar Edition of Luther's Works — 70
KANTONEN, T. A.
The Spiritual and Theological Basis of Evangelism and Stewardship — 271
Reviews of: Nixon, *Responsible Christianity* — 322
Tillich, *Systematic Theology* — 419
KEGLEY, CHARLES W.
Review of: Schilpp (ed.), *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist* — 427
KIPLOKS, EDGARS
The Lutheran Church in Russia — 46
KNUDSEN, J.
Review of: Buttrick, *So We Believe, So We Pray* — 324
KRAMM, H. H.
Luther's Teaching on Christian Responsibility in Politics and Public Life — 308
KRONER, RICHARD
The Meaning of the Reformation Today

LADWIG, H. K.
Review of: Asmussen, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser* — 92
LECHLEITNER, R. D.
Review of: Habel, *Snapshots* — 116
LEHMANN, H. T.
Cross and Creation — 201
LEUPOLD, H. C.
Reviews of: Garrett, *Growth in Prayer* — 114
Suter and Cleveland, *The American Book of Common Prayer* — 117
Allis, *The Unity of Israel* — 417
LEUPOLD, U. S.
Review of: Asmussen, *Warum noch Lutherische Kirche* — 107
MATTSON, A. D.
Reviews of: Nordquist, *Praktisk Psykologi* — 236
Bohlin, *Debatt Med Profan-Humanismen* — 325
MENDENHALL, GEORGE E.
Review of: Smith, *The Physician Examines the Bible* — 329
MOOSE, J. B.
Review of: Kreider, *The Beginnings of Lutheranism in New York* — 110
MYERS, J. M.
Review of: Bewer, *The Book of Isaiah, Vols. I and II* — 98
NOTHHACKSBERGER, O.
Review of: Lilje, *Luther* — 229
OLSON, O. N.
Reviews of: Menn, *Oekumenischer Katechismus* — 236
Pleijel, *Kyrkohistoriska arkivet i Lund* — 236
Norrbrink, *Vårt Kyrko-År* — 237
Melin, *Konfirmationen i nutidsdebatten* — 237
PAULSSEN, BERTHA
Of Repentance — 383
PRENTER, REGIN
The Doctrine of the Real Presence — 156
PREUS, H. A.
Review of: Vermeil, Hahn and Bras, *Les Eglises en Allemegne* — 230
RASMUSSEN, C. C.
Reviews of: Lewis, *Morals and the New Theology* — 104
Bosley, *A Firm Faith for Today* — 235
RAUN, JAMES J.
Review of: Hough, *The Dignity of Man* — 425
ROTH, P. H.
Review of: Bainton, *Here I Stand. A Life of Martin Luther* — 224
SCHINDLER, CARL J.
Psychology and Religion. A Study of Recent Trends — 263
SCHLINK ET AL., EDMUND
An Evangelical Opinion on the Proclamation of the Dogma of the Bodily Assumption of Mary — 123
SELTZER, GEORGE R.
Review of: Stubbings, *A Dictionary of Church Music* — 334
SITTLER, JOSEPH
Review of: Kerr, *Positive Protestantism, An Interpretation of the Gospel* — 317
SNYDER, R. D.
Reviews of: Quimby, *The Great Redemption: Commentary on Romans* — 92
Schweitzer, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* — 95
Grant, *An Introduction to New Testament Thought* — 412
Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* — 416
STAMM, R. T.
Reviews of: Goodspeed, *The Apostolic Fathers: an American Translation* — 96
Lohmeyer, *Das Vaterunser* — 218
STEVENSON, ROBERT
Luther's Musical Achievement — 255
STRENG, W. D.
Review of: Romoser, *Christ's "No"* — 114

SWARBRICK, FRANCES
Poems — 32
TAPPERT, T. G.
Reviews of: Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America* — 112
Butterfield, *Christianity and History* — 112
Schlink et al., *Gutachten zur Dogmatisierung der Himmelfahrt* — 115
Contemporary Cults as a Product of Their Environment — 142
Reviews of: Schwiebert, *Luther and His Times* — 226
Clark, *The Oxford Group: Its History and Significance* — 328
Hyma, *Renaissance to Reformation* — 431
TRAVER, A. J.
Review of: Polack, *Beside Still Waters* — 237
VAN DEUSEN, R. E.
Review of: Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital* — 232
WAHLSTROM, E. H.
Reviews of: Johansson, *Bibelns värld och vår* — 94
Goodspeed, *A Life of Jesus* — 217
Richardson (Ed.), *A Theological Word Book of the Bible* — 329
WENTZ, A. R.
Review of: Friedmann, *Mennonite Piety through the Centuries* — 109
WINGREN, GUSTAV
The Theology of Einar Billing — 60
WOLF, C. UMHAU
Fifty Years of Biblical Archaeology (Part I) — 289
Fifty Years of Biblical Archaeology (Part II) — 402
Review of: Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* — 332

II. BOOKS REVIEWED

Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah* — 417
Allport, *The Individual and His Religion* — 113
Askmark, *Ämbetet i den Svenska Kyrkan* — 318
Asmussen, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser* — 92
Asmussen, *Warum noch Lutherische Kirche?* — 107
Baillie, *The Belief in Progress* — 316
Bainton, *Here I Stand. A Life of Martin Luther* — 224
Bammel, *Das heilige Mahl* — 238
Barr, *Monk in Armour* — 227
Bewer, *The Book of Isaiah, Vols. I and II* — 98
Bohlin, *Debatt Med Profan-Humanismen* — 325
Bokser, *The Legacy of Maimonides* — 326
Books for Children of Various Ages — 114
Bosley, *A Firm Faith for Today* — 235
Brilioth, *Herdabrev till Uppsala ärkestift* — 430
Brilioth, *Nattvarden i evangeliskt gurstjänstliv* — 412
Butterfield, *Christianity and History* — 112
Buttrick, *So We Believe, So We Pray* — 324
Caemerer, *The Church in the World* — 106
Cailliet and Blankenagel (trans.), *Pascal's Short Life of Christ* — 331
Clark, *The Oxford Group: Its History and Significance* — 328
Colwell, Kraeling and Parvis, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* — 216
Douglass, *The Snowden-Douglass Sunday School Lessons, 1952* — 419
Ebersole, *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital* — 232
Echternach, *Der Kommende* — 118
Fleming, *Living as Comrades* — 321
Franke, *Evangelischer Aufbruch* — 117
Friedmann, *Mennonite Piety Through the Centuries* — 109
Garrett, *Growth in Prayer* — 114
Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* — 416
Goodspeed, *The Apostolic Fathers: an American Translation* — 96
Goodspeed, *A Life of Jesus* — 217

Grant, *An Introduction to New Testament Thought* 412
Habel, *Snapshots* 116
Hay, *Blind Spot in Public Education* 237
Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* 332
Heim, *Gottesglaube und die Naturwissenschaft* 103
Heim, *Leading a Sunday Church School* 113
Herzel, *More Than Bread* 335
Hofrenning, *Captain Jens Munk's Septentrionalis* 232
Hök, *Herrnhutisk Teologi i Svensk Gestalt* 231
Hough, *The Dignity of Man* 424
Hyma, *Renaissance to Reformation* 431
Johansson, *Bibelns värld och vår* 94
Karlström, *Ekumeniska Preludier* 326
Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* 426
Kerr, *Positive Protestantism, An Interpretation of the Gospel* 317
Knudsen and Mortensen, *The Danish-American Immigrant. Phases of his Religion and Culture* 328
Knudson, *Basic Issues in Christian Thought* 323
Kreider, *The Beginnings of Lutheranism in New York* 110
Kunze, *Die gottesdienstliche Schriftlesung* 334
Lamont, *The Illusion of Immortality* 422
Lentz et al., *Story of the Midwest Synod* 111
Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* 417
Lewis, *Morals and the New Theology* 104
Lilje, *Luther* 229
Lindroth, *Recent Theological Research in Sweden* 106
Little, *Explanation of the Book of Revelation* 222
Loewenich, *Menschsein und Christsein bei Augustin, Luther, Burckhardt* 231
Lofts, *Esther* 217
Lohmeyer, *Das Vaterunser* 218
Magary, *Saints Without Halos* 223
Malmeström, J. A. Eklund, *En biografi* 112
Meek, *Hebrew Origins* 213
Melin, *Konfirmationen i nutidsdebatten* 237
Menn, *Oekumenischer Katechismus* 236
Moe, *The Apostle Paul: His Life and Work* 221
Nixon, *Responsible Christianity* 322
Nordquist, *Praktisk Psykologi* 236
Norrbrink, *Vårt Kyrko-År* 237
Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* 91
Oxnam, *The Church and Contemporary Change* 319
Pleijel, *Kyrkohistoriska arkivet i Lund* 236
Polack, *Beside Still Waters* 237
Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* 212
Quimby, *The Great Redemption: Commentary on Romans* 92
Ramsey, *Basic Christian Ethics* 233
Richardson, *The Gospel and Modern Thought* 233
Richardson (Ed.), *A Theological Work Book of the Bible* 329
Romoser, *Christ's "No"* 114
Rutenber, *The Dagger and the Cross* 116
Schlink et al., *Gutachten zur Dogmatisierung der Himmelfahrt* 115
Schilpp, *Albert Einstein, Philosopher-Scientist* 427
Schneider, *Kennen und Erkennen* 420
Schweitzer, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* 95
Schwiebert, *Luther and his Times* 226
Silver, *The Way to God* 238
Smith, *On Whom the Spirit Came* 414
Smith, *The Physician Examines the Bible* 329
Stapel, *Luther's Lieder und Gedichte* 228
Stubbings, *A Dictionary of Church Music* 334
Suter and Cleveland, *The American Book of Common Prayer* 117
Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America* 112
Swenson, *The Faith of a Scholar* 327

Tillich, *Systematic Theology, Volume I* 419
Vermeil, Hahn and Bras, *Les Eglises en Allemegne* 230
Verkuyl, *Berkeley Version of the New Testament* 330
Wedel, *The Christianity of Main Street* 115
Wilder, *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus* 95
Williams, *God's Grace and Man's Hope* 98
Williamson, *Moses, Who First Saw Our Pyramid of Life* 216
Wisloff, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* 315
Ylvisaker, *Service Prayer Book* 335